



GEORGE V

THE OXFORD HISTORY OF ENGLAND

FOR SCHOOLS IN INDIA

BY

VINCENT A. SMITH

M.A. (DUBLIN) I.C.S. (RETIRED)
AUTHOR OF 'THE OXFORD STUDENT'S HISTORY OF
THE EARLY HISTORY OF INDIA' ETC

New edition brought to date by

R. B. MOWAT

FELLOW AND TUTOR OF CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE, OXFORD

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS

1924

PREFACE

THE distinctive feature of this little book is that it has been written specially for Schools in India. All the more or less similar histories now in use in India—some of which are excellent in their way—have the defect that they were written primarily for boys in England and are therefore obscure to the pupils of schools and colleges in India. The lad from a village or country town in India is necessarily ignorant of many things familiar from earliest childhood to his fellow student in England, just as a boy in England usually knows nothing of things Indian.

If students in India are to learn English, or more accurately, British history with understanding, many things must be explained to them in simple words which require no explanation for the youngest reader in England. That principle has governed the writing of every page in this book, and whenever occasion permitted, an attempt has been made to illustrate the unfamiliar happenings of Europe by the more familiar facts of the story of India.

In the distribution of the narrow space available a comparatively liberal allowance has been given to the more important periods, the account of those less significant being correspondingly curtailed. I have tried to be 'plain and brief' in accordance with the advice of Samuel Butler.

As 'tis a greater mystery in the art
Of painting to foreshorten any part
Than draw it out, so 'tis in books the chief
Of all perfections to be plain and brief

A small abstract like this, of course, offers no scope for independent research, and must be based mainly upon the results

of the best and latest specialists. But the statements of modern historians have been frequently checked by reference to original printed authorities. On disputed questions, which are numerous, that view is stated which seems to me to be nearest the truth. It is hoped that the knowledge of Indian needs acquired by the writer during a long period of service in India in close touch with the people may have enabled him to give the untravelled student in India the sort of help that he needs.

In accordance with usage this book is entitled a *History of England*, not a *History of the United Kingdom*, although, so far as the closely restricted limits of space allow, the fortunes of the subordinate kingdoms are noticed.

The Syllabuses of the various Universities in India have been followed as closely as possible. The valuable criticisms of Mr H W C Davis of Balliol College, Oxford, who was good enough to read the manuscript of chapters i-xviii, have saved me from various errors in minute details.

V A S

The popularity achieved by this book with High Schools, both European and Indian, and its suitability for use in the earlier University Examinations, encouraged the Publishers to invite Mr R B Mowat of Corpus Christi College, Oxford to bring it up to date. This he has done, and some new illustrations have been added. It is hoped therefore that this history will now prove as useful as ever to young students in India.

CONTENTS

c

BOOK I

ENGLAND BEFORE THE NORMAN CONQUEST

CHAPTER	PAGE
I INTRODUCTION THE COUNTRY AND THE PEOPLE	11
II THE ROMAN OCCUPATION, 55 B.C. TO A.D. 410	17
III THE EARLY ENGLISH OR SAXON KINGDOMS, THE CONVERSION OF ENGLAND, 449-871	24
IV ALFRED THE GREAT AND HIS SUCCESSORS 871-1016	34
V THE DANISH KINGS, EDWARD THE CONFESSOR HAROLD THE SON OF GODWIN, BATTLE OF HASTINGS OR SEYNLADE, 1017-66	45

BOOK II

THE EARLY NORMAN AND ANGEVIN KINGS, HENRY I 1066-1272

VI THE EARLY NORMAN KINGS 1066-1154	53
VII HENRY II (OF ANJOU) AND HIS SONS 1154-1216	61
VIII HENRY III, 1216-72	75

BOOK III

EDWARD I TO THE DEATH OF HENRY VII

IX EDWARD I AND EDWARD II 1272-1327	83
X EDWARD III AND RICHARD II 1327-99	92
XI HOUSE OF LANCASTER HENRY IV, HENRY V AND HENRY VI, TO THE BEGINNING OF THE WARS OF THE ROSES 1399-1455	104
XII THE WARS OF THE ROSES AND HOUSE OF YORK, TO THE BATTLE OF BOSWORTH 1455-85	115
XIII THE TUDOR DYNASTY UNION OF LANCASTER AND YORK, HENRY VII 1485-1509	122

BOOK IV

HENRY VIII TO THE REVOLUTION, 1509-1689

CHAPTER	PAGE
XIV. HENRY VIII, EDWARD VI, AND MARY I, 1509-58 . . .	129
XV ELIZABETH, 1558-1603 . . .	148
XVI THE STUART DYNASTY, JAMES I AND CHARLES I, TO THE • OUTBREAK OF THE CIVIL WAR, 1603-42 . . .	167
XVII THE CIVIL WAR, THE COMMONWEALTH AND THE PROTEC- TORATE, 1642-60 . . .	190
XVIII THE STUART DYNASTY RESTORED, CHARLES II AND JAMES II, TO THE REVOLUTION, 1660-89 . . .	207

BOOK V

THE REVOLUTION TO THE DEATH OF QUEEN VICTORIA,
1689-1901

XIX. WILLIAM III AND MARY II; ANNE, 1689-1714 . . .	229
XX. GEORGE I AND GEORGE II, 1714-60 . . .	244
XXI THE PRINCE OF GEORGE III TO THE FRENCH REVOLUTION 1760-89 . . .	261
XXII THE REIGN OF GEORGE III, THE WAR OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION, 1789-1815 . . .	284
XXIII THE CLOSING YEARS OF THE REIGN OF GEORGE III, THE REIGNS OF GEORGE IV AND WILLIAM IV, 1815-37. . .	311
XIV. THE PRINCE OF QUEEN VICTORIA, FROM 1837 TO THE OUTBREAK OF THE CRIMEAN WAR, 1854 . . .	326
XXV THE REIGN OF QUEEN VICTORIA, FROM 1854 TO 1901 . . .	339
XXVI EDWARD VII AND GEORGE V . . .	367
INDEX	378

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

	PAGE
GEORGE V	<i>Frontispiece</i>
JULIUS CAESAR	18
COIN OF CLAUDIUS	20
THE ROMAN WALL	22
EDINBURGH CASTLE	37
THE ALFRED JEWEL	37
ALFRED THE GREAT	39
SAXON AND NORMAN SOLDIERS	40
NORWEGIAN AXE	51
CIVIL COSTUME c 1200	69
CHAIN ARMOUR 1200	70
AYDON CASTLE	78
TOMB OF HENRY III	81
EDWARD I AND ILLANOR	85
THE BLACK PRINCE	96
THE ROUND TOWER AT WINDSOR	101
RICHARD II	10
ARCHER AND CROSSBOW MAN	104
HENRY V	109
A FIFTEENTH CENTURY SHIP	111
RICHARD III	119
COIN OF HENRY VII	122
HENRY VIII	131
6 TUDOR MEDALS	144
QUEEN ELIZABETH	149
MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS	152
ELIZABETHAN MAN OF WAR	157
THE ARMADA MEDAL	158
COIN OF ELIZABETH	162
6 SIR WALTER RALPH	173
FRANCIS BACON	177
STUART AND CROMWELLIAN MEDALS	180
CHARLES I	181

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

9

	PAGE
COIN OF CHARLES I	191
COIN OF CHARLES II	207
COIN OF CHARLES II	210
COIN OF JAMES II	216
STUART MEDALS	219
JOHN MILTON	221
SIR CHRISTOPHER WREN AND ST PAUL'S CATHEDRAL	23
LORD CLIVE	255
GEORGE III	263
WARREN HASTINGS	273
LORD CORNWALLIS	281
LORD NELSON	288
THE MARQUESS WELLESLEY	291
NAPOLEON BONAPARTE	29
THE VICTORY	1
THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON	303
QUEEN VICTORIA	326
WILLIAM EWAERT GLADSTONE	356
KING EDWARD VII	36
H.R.H. THE PRINCE OF WALES	373

MAPS

GREAT BRITAIN	10
BRITISH ISLES AND WEST COAST OF EUROPE	1
FRANCE	64
IRELAND	9
THE NETHERLANDS	238
CANADA AND EASTERN UNITED STATES	268
THE CAMPAIGN IN THE CRUSA	340

The illustrations on pp. 32, 40, 61, 69, 70, 78, 106, 111, 157 are taken from Mr. F. P. Barnard's *Companion to English History Middle Ages* (Clarendon Press). The portraits on pp. 141, 19, 219, 23 are from medals in the British Museum. Mr. Emery Walker has supplied a number of photographs. Other acknowledgements of the use of copyright illustrations are made in the respective places.



BOOK I

ENGLAND BEFORE THE NORMAN CONQUEST

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION—THE COUNTRY AND THE PEOPLE

Position.—The British Isles, separated from the continent by shallow seas named the German Ocean or North Sea and the English Channel, are the most westerly part of Europe. The main island, about 600 miles long from north to south, is known as Great Britain to distinguish it from Britain the Less, or Brittany, now a province of France. The country to the north of the river Tweed is Scotland and that to the south is England, with Wales on the west.

Ireland, to the west of Great Britain, from which it is separated by St. George's Channel and the Irish Sea, is about 300 miles in length from north to south. Many smaller islands lie round the coasts of both Great Britain and Ireland. The most notable are the Channel Islands—Jersey, Guernsey, &c.—in the English Channel, near the French coast; the Isle of Wight, off Hampshire; Anglesey, to the north west of Wales; the Isle of Man, midway between Great Britain and Ireland; and three groups of islands off the coast of Scotland, namely, the Hebrides on the west, and the Shetlands and Orkneys on the north.

Government.—The two principal islands, including the small islands near the coasts, form the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, but their union as such has been the work of many centuries. England, once divided into many principalities, was not thoroughly made one until 1070,

four years after the Norman Conquest Scotland had kings of its own until 1603, and did not cease to be a foreign country until 1707. Ireland, partially conquered at the close of the twelfth century, became a member of the United Kingdom as late as 1801. Wales was annexed to England in the thirteenth century.

The Channel Islands, part of William the Conqueror's Duchy of Normandy and not included in the United Kingdom, are still governed under modified Norman laws by a parliament of their own. The Isle of Man, once a separate kingdom, also has its own parliament and legal system, and does not form part of the United Kingdom.

Each of the four greater divisions of the United Kingdom—England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales—has its special character, customs, and laws. The law of Scotland, especially, differs widely from that of England, Wales, and Ireland.

Languages—Indian students may not realize the fact that English is by no means the sole language of the British Isles. In addition to the old-fashioned French spoken in the Channel Islands and the nearly extinct Celtic Manx language of the Gaelic class still used to some extent in the Isle of Man, three languages other than English are to this day the mother tongues of large numbers of people, most of whom, however, know English also. These three languages all belong to the Celtic group of the Indo-European family, and are (1) the Gaelic or Irish of Ireland, (2) the Gaelic of the Highlands of Scotland, and (3) the Welsh. The two forms of Gaelic spoken in Scotland and Ireland are so closely related that some people regard them rather as dialects than as separate languages. But the Welsh, a member of the Brythonic section of the Celtic tongues, is quite distinct from the Gaelic tongues and akin to the Breton of Brittany or Britain the Less in France. Until late in the eighteenth century an allied tongue now extinct was spoken in Cornwall, the south-western extremity of England.

The Earliest Inhabitants.—Once upon a time far too long

ago for any attempt at dates, the shallow seas which now part the British Isles from the continent and each other did not exist, and men could pass on dry land from any part of Europe to what is now the United Kingdom. The earliest dwellers in the islands no doubt came that way. They were rude savages, ignorant of the use of metal, and doing the best they could with stone tools, like the similar primitive folk in India. Learned men think that in certain dark-hured people of small stature found chiefly in the western parts of Great Britain and Ireland we may trace descendants of some of those ancient tribes. Long afterwards came by sea invasions of Kelts mostly fair hured people, some of whom spoke the Brythonic tongues of Wales and Cornwall while others spoke the Gaelic of Ireland and Scotland. At a much later time many Keltic settlers from Gaul made their homes in south eastern England.

Angles, Saxons and Jutes.—From the fourth century of the Christian era pirates from the shores of the Baltic Sea in the north of Europe began to cross the North Sea in swift ships and to make raids for plunder into Great Britain where from the fifth century onwards many of the invaders stried and settled down. They belonged to related tribes called Angles, Saxons, and Jutes. The Jute settlements were of limited extent, chiefly in Kent and the Isle of Wight.

Danes—They were followed in the eighth century by the Danes from Denmark (including Norsemen from Norway), who also were pirates and akin to the Saxon tribes. Even in Ireland the Danes ravaged the coasts and formed many permanent settlements. Dublin, Wexford, and Waterford, for example, are towns of Danish origin.

Anglo Saxon and Danish Rule—These pirate invaders were all fierce, cruel fighting men too strong for the Keltic Britons, when the Roman legions had gone. Thus in course of time most of the Britons were killed, enslaved, or driven into the hills, so that England passed under the rule of the descendants of the strangers who were numerous enough to people a great

part of the country. The population of England and the Lowlands of Scotland is now more largely Anglo-Saxon or Danish than anything else, but in Wales, Ireland, and the Highlands of Scotland the Keltic element is strong.

Mixture of Races in the United Kingdom.—Nothing like a pure-blooded race, however, exists anywhere in the British Isles, except possibly in some out of the way corners. Everywhere the various races named (and others not mentioned) have mingled more or less and the modern 'Britisher', to use a convenient American word is the result. Long after the days of the pirates had passed away colonies of Normans, Jews, Flemings, Frenchmen and others settled at various times in both Great Britain and Ireland and helped to build up the nation. The special qualities which have enabled the people of the United Kingdom to take the position in the world which they now hold must be due in no small measure to such mixture of blood. Nevertheless the character of the English in England as their name (English=Angle) indicates is derived mainly from their Anglo-Saxon ancestors or from the Danes who were similar in their notions and habits.

Natural Advantages of England.—The principal cause of the wonderful growth of the power of England no doubt is the character of her people who have proved themselves to possess the capacity for rule. But the English have been much helped by the natural advantages of their country. As islanders dwelling in a land with a coast line of immense length well supplied with good harbours and as descendants of Saxon and Danish sea rovers they have naturally become the best sailors in the world skilled beyond all other men in the building and use of ships the instruments and keepers of their dominion. The temperate climate in which men can work all the year round has favoured the formation of a hardy nation able to bear both heat and cold while not exposed to the extremes of either. The soil on the whole is fertile yet not such as to yield its fruits without hard work. The rich mines of coal iron tin and other minerals have

BRITISH ISLES & WEST COAST OF EUROPE



enabled England to take the lead in trade and manufactures. The natural advantages of Ireland, Scotland, and Wales being less than those of England, that country has always been the richest, most populous and most powerful section of the British Isles. In the later chapters of this book we shall see how the English sea power grew under the care of Alfred, Edward III, Henry VIII, and other rulers until it reached its present greatness, and we shall trace in outline the manner in which commerce and manufactures starting from small beginnings, developed into the vast system of to-day, so that London, once little more than a fortified village, has become the commercial capital of the world.

The Interest of English History—Such a story is worth telling and worth learning. But the interest of the history of England is not confined to the study of the extension of the power of her kings, the growth of her navy, and the development of trade and industry. England has been and is a teacher of the nations. Through much blood and suffering many errors, and some crimes her people have won the ordered freedom which they now enjoy in more fullness than any other nation, and the civilized nations of the world have not been slow to copy English methods and forms of government. In literature science and philosophy English names rank among those of the foremost of mankind and no nation is too proud to do reverence to the memory of Shakespeare, Bacon, Newton and Darwin. In these latter days the wide spread of the English tongue to the uttermost parts of the earth gives special weight and influence to the thoughts of authors who write in that language.

England the Mother of Nations—England too is the mother of nations. Her adult daughter, the United States of America may soon find a rival at least equal to herself in the Dominion of Canada, while in Africa and at the opposite side of the globe other young daughter nations are springing into active and vigorous life.

England and India—India the home of a civilization

already ancient in the days when Britons were still clad in skins and painted with woad has passed under the sceptre of the English King Emperor, and the still more potent sway of English ideas. One of the greatest tasks of the English to-day is the understanding of India's needs, and on the other hand it is equally the duty of India to try to understand England. The task is not an easy one for either party. Perhaps this little book may have the good fortune to help young Indian readers to make a beginning in learning something of the history and character of the distant island in the Western Ocean with the fortunes of which the fate of their own land has become so strangely entwined.

CHAPTER II

THE ROMAN OCCUPATION 53 B C TO A.D. 410

Julius Caesar—In the middle of the first century B C the government of the City of Rome had brought into subjection not only the whole of Italy, but all the countries round the Mediterranean Sea. About that time Julius Caesar the greatest of Roman generals was engaged in completing the conquest of Gaul now called France, and in winning for himself the chief power in the Roman State. He succeeded so well that in 44 B C when he was murdered Gaul was a Roman province and he had become master of the Roman world. He thus laid the basis for the rule of the Emperors, the first of whom was Augustus his adopted son. All succeeding emperors took the titles of Caesar and Augustus, and now our King Emperor George V is proud to be called the Caesar of India (*Kaisar-i-Hind*).

The earliest knowledge of Great Britain in any detail that we have is gained from the writings of Julius Caesar, who in 55 B C crossed over from Gaul with a small army, and



JULIUS CAESAR (BRITISH MUSEUM)

landed on the British coast¹ In the next year he came again with a larger force, and stayed some time, fighting hard, but without making any lasting conquest

The Britons.—Caesar, who could write as well as he could fight, gives an interesting account of the people of South-eastern Britain The dense population was divided into numerous tribes, each under its own chief, usually at war one with the other, as the tribes of the Panjab were in Alexander's time In Britain, as in India, the common danger caused by a sudden foreign attack, forced the warring tribes to unite for a moment to resist the invader Cassive launus, whose territory lay to the north of the Thames was the Porus of Britain, and, like Porus, relied largely on his skilfully managed chariots The British soldiers carried shields, and were armed with swords, daggers, spears, and axes, but did not use bows and arrows The men were brave and often inflicted serious loss on the Romans Their strong holds, like the forts of Oudh not very long ago, were hidden away among marshes and woods

The upper classes, namely, the gentry or warriors (the *equites* of Cæsar), and the Druids, or priests, corresponded respectively to the Kshatriyas and Brahmans of India The common people, treated as serfs or slaves by their superiors, were not of much account The Druids, like the Brahmans, used no written books and taught the sacred learning to their pupils by memory alone The subjects taught were much the same as those of the Brahman schools, and included the attributes of the gods, natural philosophy, the motions of the stars, and the transmigration of souls Sometimes a pupil would remain for twenty years under the instruction of his teacher (*guru*) But, for business purposes, the Greek alphabet was in use

Many gods were honoured, of whom the principal was

¹ A few notes have survived from the lost books written by Pytheas, a Greek of Massilia (Marseilles), who sailed round Great Britain about 300 B.C., and by Ptolemy, who wrote about two centuries later.

identified by the Romans with their god Mercurius. The worship included horrible human sacrifices, effected by shutting up a number of men, usually condemned criminals, but sometimes innocent victims, in a huge wicker cage, which was set on fire. Nearly a century later these cruel rites were suppressed by the Emperor Claudius, who acted on the principle applied long afterwards by Lord William Bentinck in India to the case of suttee.

Claudius, Boudicca—The serious Roman efforts to annex this island began in the time of Claudius (A.D. 43), whose



COIN OF CLAUDIUS

generals Aulus Plautius and his successors, conquered south-eastern Britain and made it a Roman province. Gradually the imperial power spread to the west and north, but its progress was checked (A.D. 61) by the revolt of the Iceni tribe in the region now forming the counties of Norfolk and Suffolk under their queen Boudicca (Boadicea) who had been cruelly ill-used. She burst

fiercely on the Roman settlements sacking the three towns now represented by London, St. Albans, and Colchester, and killing it is said 70,000 of her enemies. But the rude valour of the tribes could not withstand the weight of Roman discipline, and the revolt was crushed. Now, in these latter days, Englishmen have honoured the righteously rebel queen with a statue which stands beside Westminster Bridge in London. For some three centuries after the suppression of Boudicca's rising, southern Britain enjoyed almost unbroken peace.

Agricola.—Agricola, an able Roman general (A.D. 78–85), brought the rest of England and the Lowlands of Scotland under Roman sway, but had to leave most of the hilly parts

of Scotland and Wales unsubdued nor was he able to attack Ireland, as he had hoped to do. He was a just man and a capable ruler. Under his care the rude Britons began to learn civilized Roman ways, especially in the towns, which grew rapidly in size and importance. York (Eboracum) in the north became the Roman capital of the province.

The Walls of Hadrian and Antoninus—During the reign of the Emperor Hadrian (117-38), who stayed some time in Britain, a strong rampart of turf sods, 80 Roman miles in length, was built across the narrow part of the island between Tynemouth on the east and the sea beyond Carlisle on the west, in order to keep out the Picts and other fierce tribes of the north, who used to harry the settled province, just as the Pathan clans now raid the north western frontier of India. About the year 210 Hadrian's rampart was strengthened by a stone wall erected under the orders of the Emperor Septimius Severus. In the reign of Antoninus Pius (140), a second rampart of turf had been built farther north across the still narrower neck of land, 36 miles wide, between the Firth of Forth and the Firth of Clyde. The Romans tried hard to conquer the difficult country north of the wall of Antoninus and established some outposts but could not subdue the tribes, and late in the second or early in the third century were forced to retire to the line of Hadrian's wall.

Carausius and Allectus—Towards the close of the third century, for nearly ten years (287-96) Britain was ruled by Roman emperors of her own, not dependent upon Rome. In the earlier year named, Carausius, a man of humble origin and either Gaulish or British birth, who had been Admiral of the Channel Fleet stationed at Boulogne revolted and set up as independent Emperor of Britain. For seven years he ruled with great success and prosperity, until he was murdered by an officer of his, by name Allectus who seized the throne and held it for three years. The usurper was then crushed by an imperial army.

End of the Roman Occupation—During the fourth century



THE BUILDING OF THE WALL

From the drawing by Mr Henry Ford in *A School History of England* by
C. R. L. Fletcher and Richard Hogg

the coasts and borderlands of Britain suffered much from the raids of wild tribes. The Picts and other savage nations of Caledonia, now Scotland, ravaged the north, while the west coast was harried by Irish pirates, then called Scots, the southern and eastern coasts being similarly tormented by Saxon and other rovers from German lands. An ancient historian observes that those enemies 'trampled and overran all places, and like men mowing ripe corn, bore down all before them'. At the beginning of the fifth century Rome herself could no longer resist the attacks of the barbarian hosts, swarming down overland from the north, and was wholly unable to protect a province so distant as Britain. Most of the garrison was withdrawn in 407 and three years later, when Rome was taken by Alaric the Goth, Honorius, Emperor of the West, was obliged to tell the Britons that they must fight their own battles as best they could. The year 410, therefore, is usually taken to mark the end of the Roman occupation, which had lasted in the south east of England from the time of Claudius (43), and in the rest of the province south of Hadrian's wall from the time of Agricola (85).

Effects of the Roman Occupation.—During that long period town life in a civilized fashion had been largely developed, and the numerous remains of luxurious and comfortable gentlemen's houses testify to the general peace and prosperity of the country. Many of the notable cities and towns now existing, as for example, London, York, Chester, and Gloucester, are practically the creation of the Romans. The British 'towns' were rather fortified villages composed of rude huts. Whenever we find the word *chester* or *cester* forming part of a town name, we know that the place was once a Roman settlement or cantonment (*castra*). The stations throughout the country were connected by splendid, straight, solidly paved roads, some of which are still in use, although of course, changed in appearance. Tillage was much extended, the coal and iron mines in the south and

Latin traditions. The story of the Roman occupation, therefore, has little vital connexion with the history of England and concerns the antiquary rather than the historian¹

LEADING DATES

Invasions of Julius Caesar	55, 54 B C
Invasion of Aulus Plautius (Claudius emperor)	A D. 43
Revolt of Queen Boudicca	61
Agricola	78-85
Hadrian's wall	between 117 and 133
Wall of Antoninus	about 140
Wall of Septimius Severus	about 210
Carausius and Allectus	287-96
End of Roman occupation	about 410

CHAPTER III

THE EARLY ENGLISH OR SAXON KINGDOMS THE CONVERSION OF ENGLAND, 449-871

Beginning of the English Conquest.—The real history of England may be held to begin in the middle of the fifth century (449) with the settlement in the Isle of Thuret on the south-eastern coast of a small band of Jute warriors from Jutland in Denmark, who, according to tradition, came at the invitation of a British chief named Vortigern to help him against his foes. The new-comers, said to have been led by chiefs named Hengest and Horsa, liked their quarters, and were quickly followed by crowds of their countrymen, who arrived in large fleets, and in the course of not many years made themselves masters of Kent, Sussex, the Isle of Wight, and parts of Hampshire. The invaders comprised besides the Jutes two other closely related tribes, the Angles and

¹ The names England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales, although not current in the Roman period, are used in this chapter for convenience. The best account of the Roman occupation is that by Professor C. Oman in *England before the Norman Conquest*, 1910.

west were actively worked, and trade was brisk.¹ Books do not tell us much about the Roman occupation, the details have mostly to be worked out from inscriptions, coins, and the remains of the camps, houses, and belongings of the conquerors dug up from time to time

Britain not fully romanized — But, notwithstanding the considerable remains of Roman settlements still tractable, it is certain that Britain never became Roman in the way that Gaul and the other countries of southern Europe did. Most of the people continued to worship their own gods, although the Christian religion was introduced perhaps in the second century, and a British Church was formed with bishops of its own. The sites of about twenty small Romano-British church buildings can be traced. Latin may have been widely understood in the south-east, but in the rest of the island the language does not seem to have been much spoken, except in the towns. The Romans, however, were not so sharply separated from the British as the English are from the Indians. Many Britons took Roman names, and large numbers served in the irregular troops which aided the legions. Intermarriages between the foreigners and natives are believed to have been common. If the Romans had been left undisturbed, they might in time have made Britain a Latin country, but the events of the troubled ages following the withdrawal of the legions blotted out nearly all the signs of the Roman occupation, except the roads and a few towns, mostly ruined, which escaped utter destruction. Even the memory of the fact that Roman officers had governed the land for between three and four centuries almost perished. England, after passing through the long agony of the Saxon and Danish invasions, to be related in the following chapters, had to make a fresh start in which she gained little help from the ruins of Roman institutions. She had to build up a new system of law, custom and government based on Germanic not on

¹ The growth of the enormous coal and iron industries in northern England and southern Scotland is quite recent

Latin traditions The story of the Roman occupation, therefore, has little vital connexion with the history of England and concerns the antiquary rather than the historian¹

LEADING DATES

Invasions of Julius Caesar	55, 54 B C
Invasion of Aulus Plautius (Claudius emperor)	A D 43
Revolt of Queen Boudicca	61
Agricola	78-85
Hadrian's wall	between 117 and 138
Wall of Antoninus	about 140
Wall of Septimius Severus	about 210
Carausius and Allectus	287-96
End of Roman occupation	about 410

CHAPTER III

THE EARLY ENGLISH OR SAXON KINGDOMS THE CONVERSION OF ENGLAND 449-871

Beginning of the English Conquest.—The real history of England may be held to begin in the middle of the fifth century (449) with the settlement in the Isle of Thanet on the south-eastern coast of a small band of Jute warriors from Jutland in Denmark, who, according to tradition came at the invitation of a British chief named Vortigern to help him against his foes. The new comers, said to have been led by chiefs named Hengest and Horsa, liked their quarters, and were quickly followed by crowds of their countrymen, who arrived in large fleets, and in the course of not many years made themselves masters of Kent, Sussex, the Isle of Wight, and parts of Hampshire. The invaders comprised besides the Jutes two other closely related tribes, the Angles and

¹ The names England Scotland Ireland and Wales although not current in the Roman period are used in this chapter for convenience. The best account of the Roman occupation is that by Professor C. Oman in *England before the Norman Conquest* 1910.

Saxons, whose homes were on the coasts of the Baltic Sea. Modern writers often speak of them all collectively as Anglo-Saxons

Cruelty of the Invaders—Their method of warfare was as terrible as that of the Mongols in Asia long ages afterwards

'The barbarous conquerors,' Bede observes 'spread the conflagration from the eastern to the western sea, without any opposition, and covered almost every part of the devoted island¹ Public as well as private structures were overturned, the priests were everywhere slain before the altars, the prelates and the people, without any respect of persons were destroyed with fire and sword nor was there any to bury those who had been thus cruelly slaughtered Some of the miserable remainder, being taken in the mountains were butchered in heaps Others spent with hunger came forth and submitted themselves to the enemy for food being destined to undergo perpetual servitude if they were not killed even upon the spot Some with sorrowful hearts, fled beyond the seas Others continuing in their own country, led a miserable life among the woods rocks and mountains, with scarcely enough food to support life, and expecting every moment to be their last

Such was the blood stained opening page of the history of England and the English

Jutes, Saxons, and Angles—While the Jutes occupied Kent and the Isle of Wight Saxons settled in the counties now known as Sussex (South Saxons), Middlesex (Middle Saxons), and Essex (East Saxons) as well as in Wessex (West Saxons), comprising Hampshire and the neighbouring counties The Angles (English) occupied Norfolk and Suffolk (North folk and South folk) and gradually pushed farther to the north and west While the Britons as do their descendants to this day, spoke of their conquerors as 'Saxons' the invaders themselves used the name 'Angles' to describe all the tribes collectively,

¹ The 'Venerable Bede', a monk of Jarrow in the north of England (673-735) wrote an *Ecclesiastical History* which is a leading authority In the passage quoted he copies from an older writer

and called their newly won land 'Anglekin', and in later times England

King Arthur—The Anglo Saxon progress in the south was stayed for a little while by a great defeat at Mount Badon (Badbury in Dorsetshire according to Mr Freeman) in A D 520 the credit of which is given by legend to the half fabulous British King Arthur, the hero of Tennyson's *Idylls of the King*

The English advance Westward—But the check was only for a time The West Saxons by winning the battle of Dyrham (Deorham 577) advanced their frontier to the Severn while their northern comrades at a later date won the important city of Chester or Deva (613) Those victories broke up the western independent territory of the Britons into three separated blocks namely Wales Cornwall and the small kingdom of Strathclyde which comprised Cumberland Before the end of the sixth century the Anglo Saxon had included about half of Britain and extended to the north as far as the Firth of Forth It was divided into many small principalities continually at war one with the other or with the Britons and ever varying in number size and power according to the fortune of war In fact the political state of Britain was much like that of India in most ages

Religion of the English.—The remote tribes on the shores of the Baltic which supplied the material for the newly formed English people lived outside the Roman Empire and had remained untouched by Roman civilization or the Christian religion For more than a century after their arrival in Britain they continued to be ferocious heathen fighting men pitiless and bloodthirsty the worshippers of fierce gods chief among whom were Woden god of war and Thor the Thunderer whose names survive in the words Wednesday and Thursday In the regions occupied the invaders practically destroyed the old Romano British Church and made England once more a heathen country At first they killed nearly all the old population but as they moved on inland

The tribes were divided into two social groups, 'eorls,' or fighting men of good birth, and 'churls' (*ceorls*), or common folk. There were also slaves, who counted only as the beasts. The business of the tribe was settled by the freemen, both eorls and churls in open meeting, presided over by a headman or 'ealdorman', whose title survives as 'alderman' with quite a different meaning. Similar public meetings managed the local business of the 'shires', or larger divisions of a kingdom of the smaller divisions or 'hundreds', corresponding to the Indian *pargana* or *tappa*, and of the 'tun', or village a group of neighbouring households organized much in the same way as an Indian *bhayaclāra* village. In their original home the Anglo Saxons do not seem to have needed kings but the stress of fighting in Britain having forced them to elect kings as leaders and commanders in chief the petty chieftainships of early days so formed always tended to unite in larger kingdoms of greater force and increased stability.

Thus arose the leading kingdoms of Northumbria comprising the lands north of the Humber and extending up to the Forth. Mercia the region of the marches or borders, comprising what are now the midland counties and Wessex in the south. There were other kingdoms too but those three were the most notable.

Supremacy of Northumbria, seventh century — Early in the seventh century Æthelfrith king of Northumbria claimed to be the Overlord (Bretwalda) of Britain a vague rank depending on the personal influence of the claimant, and similar to that of *Rāja-chakravartin* or *Maharajadhiraja*, so often boastfully assumed by early Indian princes. His successor Edwin in order to guard his northern frontier, built a strong fort the predecessor of that castle which still looks down upon the beautiful city of Edinburgh or Edwin's town, the capital of Scotland.

Supremacy of Mercia, eighth century — After many wars the leadership of the English passed from Northumbria to the kingdom of Mercia. Capital of Tamworth not

far from Birmingham The most famous of the Mercian kings was Offa, in the second half of the eighth century, who carried his victorious arms across the Severn and built the massive rampart known as 'Offa's Dyke', extending from Chepstow to near Chester, which continued for three centuries to mark the boundary between the English and the Welsh, and still stands in large part He encouraged trade, struck good coins, and corresponded on equal terms with Charles the Great (Charlemagne), King of the Franks, who was crowned as Emperor of the West in 800, a few years after Offa's death¹

Supremacy of Wessex, ninth century; Egbert.—But neither Northumbria nor Mercia was destined to be the cradle of the English monarchy and the source of England's greatness That glory was reserved for Wessex, the southern kingdom Egbert (800-39), king of that realm, subdued his neighbours of Kent and Su-sex, compelled the Britons of Cornwall to do him homage, and broke the Mercian power by a victory gained at Ellandun in Wiltshire (823) He thus became, as Edwin and Offa had been, the Overlord of Britain Circumstances and the exceptional ability of most of Egbert's successors for several generations secured the permanence of the supremacy of Wessex All the sovereigns of England, save five, can trace their descent from Egbert²

The Coming of the Danes.—But much suffering was in store for the English, who had lost their early ferocity and become a peaceful, settled people, mainly engaged in the cultivation of the fields They were now to endure misery like unto that which their forefathers had inflicted on the Britons The Danes, or Northmen of Denmark and Norway, in the

¹ The authorities differ as to the exact limits of Offa's reign. Professor Oman gives them as 757-96.

² The five exceptions are (1) the Danish Canute (Cnut), (2, 3) his sons, Harthacnut and Harthacnut (Harthacnut), (4) Harold, the son of Earl Godwin, and (5) William the Conqueror The sons of the Conqueror were descended from Alfred and Egbert through Queen Matilda, whose ancestor was a daughter of Alfred the Great

and began to till the lands won by the sword, they became less ferocious, and allowed many of the conquered race to live as slaves or serfs, who may or may not have kept alive some small remnant of the ancient church

Mission of St Augustine.—The religion of Jesus was brought anew to Britain in its Roman form by Augustine, an Italian monk sent (597) by Gregory the Great, Pope of Rome, to Ethelbert, King of Kent, whose queen was a Christian princess, daughter of the Frankish king of Paris. With the help of her influence the Kentish king and his court were induced to accept the strange religion, which soon became firmly established in the south east of England, its head quarters being Canterbury

Spread of Christianity.—Thence the new teaching gradually spread over England, being carried into Northumbria, the kingdom north of the Humber river, by Paulinus (627). The last part of England to receive the Christian faith was the Isle of Wight (686) and we may say that by 700 A.D. the whole of Anglo Saxon England had become Christian, at least in name. Little attempt was made at first to convert the people by preaching. The simpler process used was to persuade the local king to adopt the creed of Rome. As soon as he gave up the gods of his fathers, his court and people usually followed his example and accepted baptism by thousands at a time.

The Papacy.—The sending of Augustine by Gregory the Great, Pope of Rome (590-604), invites us to pause for a moment and consider the meaning of the phrase 'Pope of Rome'. From the fifth century onwards the epithet Pope (Greek *pappas*, Latin *papa* meaning 'father') which had been used generally of all bishops, the rulers of the Christian Church, began to be specially applied to the Bishop of Rome, the imperial city. That Bishop, being regarded as the head of West-European Christendom, proceeded to claim a sort of imperial authority over all the churches, and even over all the kings of Europe. Various causes which cannot be dis-

cessed here helped him to gradually make good his claims. The earliest recorded instance of a pope's exercise of authority over a king dates from the ninth century. In later years the power of the Papacy, that is to say, of the Pope's administration, *vastly increased, and even now it is a potent influence in Europe, and so throughout the world.* The mission of St. Augustine in 597 brought England into touch with the Roman Church and to some extent with Roman law and modes of thought. The ancient British Church of Wales and Ireland which still subsisted submitted very slowly and unwillingly to the authority of the Pope.

Asiatic Equivalent of the Pope.—Nothing in Asia exactly corresponds with the jurisdiction exercised by the Popes, but the authority conceded by Muslims to the Shirkh ul Islam at Constantinople is to some extent similar. The Buddhist system of church government, as practised long ago in India, and now in Tibet and Burma may help Indian students to realize the immense authority wielded by the Popes and Bishops in Europe during many ages. The Dalai Lama of Lhasa is the nearest Asiatic equivalent of the Pope and the higher Buddhist clergy have duties and powers resembling to some extent those of bishops and archbishops.

The Government of the English.—The English, that is to say, the Angles, Saxons, and Jutes, brought with them the manners and customs of their fathers as practised on the shores of the Baltic. The ferocity of their warfare having utterly destroyed the ancient British and Roman manners and customs, left the new-comers, so to speak, 'a clean slate' on which to write a new English polity. Hence it is that practically all English institutions are of Germanic Anglo-Saxon origin, showing hardly a trace of Roman or Celtic-British influence. The Baltic Anglo-Saxons had no towns, and when they first came to Britain knew nothing better to do with a town than burn it. But when they had been settled down for a time they learned how to live as citizens and to manage the local affairs of towns with success.

The tribes were divided into two social groups, 'eorls,' or fighting men of good birth, and 'churls' (*ceorls*), or common folk. There were also slaves, who counted only as the beasts. The business of the tribe was settled by the freemen, both eorls and churls, in open meeting, presided over by a headman or 'ealdorman', whose title survives as 'alderman' with quite a different meaning. Similar public meetings managed the local business of the 'shires', or larger divisions of a kingdom, of the smaller divisions, or 'hundreds', corresponding to the Indian *pargana* or *tappa*, and of the 'tun', or village, a group of neighbouring households, organized much in the same way as an Indian *bhayachara* village. In their original home the Anglo Saxons do not seem to have needed kings, but the stress of fighting in Britain having forced them to elect kings as leaders and commanders in chief, the petty chieftainships of early days so formed always tended to unite in larger kingdoms of greater force and increased stability.

Thus arose the leading kingdoms of Northumbria, comprising the lands north of the Humber, and extending up to the Forth, Mercia the region of the marches or borders, comprising what are now the midland counties, and Wessex in the south. There were other kingdoms too, but those three were the most notable.

Supremacy of Northumbria, seventh century—Early in the seventh century Æthelfrith, King of Northumbria, claimed to be the Overlord (Bretwalda) of Britain, a vague rank depending on the personal influence of the claimant, and similar to that of *Raja-chakravartin* or *Maharajadhiraja*, so often boastfully assumed by early Indian princes. His successor Edwin, in order to guard his northern frontier, built a strong fort, the predecessor of that castle which still looks down upon the beautiful city of Edinburgh, or Edwin's town, the capital of Scotland.

Supremacy of Mercia, eighth century—After many wars the leadership of the English passed from Northumbria to the Kingdom of Mercia, the capital of which was Tamworth, not


far from Birmingham. The most famous of the Mercian kings was Offa, in the second half of the eighth century, who carried his victorious arms across the Severn and built the massive rampart known as 'Offa's Dyke', extending from Chepstow to near Chester, which continued for three centuries to mark the boundary between the English and the Welsh, and still stands in large part. He encouraged trade, struck good coins, and corresponded on equal terms with Charles the Great (Charlemagne), King of the Franks, who was crowned as Emperor of the West in 800, a few years after Offa's death¹.

Supremacy of Wessex, ninth century; Egbert.—But neither Northumbria nor Mercia was destined to be the cradle of the English monarchy and the source of England's greatness. That glory was reserved for Wessex, the southern kingdom. Egbert (800–39), king of that realm, subdued his neighbours of Kent and Sussex, compelled the Britons of Cornwall to do him homage and broke the Mercian power by a victory gained at Ellandun in Wiltshire (823). He thus became, as Edwin and Offa had been, the Overlord of Britain. Circumstances and the exceptional ability of most of Egbert's successors for several generations secured the permanence of the supremacy of Wessex. All the sovereigns of England, save five, can trace their descent from Egbert².

The Coming of the Danes.—But much suffering was in store for the English, who had lost their early ferocity and become a peaceful, settled people, mainly engaged in the cultivation of the fields. They were now to endure misery like unto that which their forefathers had inflicted on the Britons. The Danes, or Northmen of Denmark and Norway, in the

¹ The authorities differ as to the exact limits of Offa's reign. Professor Oman gives them as 757–96.

² The five exceptions are (1) the Danish Canute (Cnút), (2–3) his sons, Harólf and Harólfcanute (Harthacnut), (4) Harold the son of Earl Godwin, and (5) William the Conqueror. The sons of the Conqueror were descended from Alfred and Egbert through Queen Matilda, whose ancestor was a daughter of Alfred the Great.



EDINBURGH CASTLE

eighth century were similar in their habits and mode of life to the Anglo-Saxon pirates of the fifth and sixth centuries, to whom they were akin in race, religion, and language. In the year 787 a small body of Danish raiders (*vik-ings*) landed from three ships on the south-eastern coast, and slew the local Saxon officer. Many similar descents followed, but the raiders did not attempt to settle until the middle of the ninth century. 'This year (851),' says the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, 'did the heathen folk, for the first time, bide over winter.'¹

Danish Attack on Wessex.—Egbert had been strong enough to protect his kingdom against suffering much serious damage, but his son Æthelwulf was thrice defeated by the pirates. At Oakley, however (851), the fortune of war favoured the Saxons. But still, every year, the Danes continued to pour in and strengthen their grip on the land. In 871 they made a powerful attack on Wessex, which was withstood by the sons of Æthelwulf, who gained a glorious victory over the heathen host at Ashdown in Berkshire, 'fighting on even unto nightfall.' During that terrible year the men of Wessex fought no less than nine battles with the enemy, 'the Host,' as it is called in the *Chronicle*. In the same year Alfred, the last available of the sons of Æthelwulf, was elected to the throne of Wessex, and called to the hard task of beating back the ever swelling flood of heathen invasion.²

LEADING DATES

First arrival of Saxons (Hengest and Horsa)	449
Battle of Mount Badon (Badbury; 'King Arthur')	520
Westward advance of Saxons (Battle of Dyrham)	577

¹ The *Anglo Saxon Chronicle*, extant in six early manuscripts, is the leading authority for early English history. It exists in four distinct forms, written at various monasteries. The original form is said to have been compiled under the direction of King Alfred.

² 'Last available,' not counting one son, Æthelstan, who had become a monk, and is identified by some writers with St. Neot, Alfred's counsellor. In Anglo-Saxon times the member of the royal family considered to be the most worthy was elected king. The election of Alfred excluded the son of an elder brother.

Mission of St. Augustine to Kent	597
Battle of Chester (Deva)	613
King Edwin of Northumbria (Edinburgh)	617-33
King Offa of Mercia	about 757-96
King Egbert of Wessex	800-830
First landing of the Danes (old <i>ings</i>)	787
First settlement of the Danes	851

CHAPTER IV

ALFRED THE GREAT AND HIS SUCCESSORS, 871-1016

Early Life of Alfred.—Like many great men,

Alfred,
England's darling,
England's shepherd,
England's king,

owed much to his mother, by name Osburga, 'a devout woman, and keen of wit [understanding] withal, great of heart, as high in birth.' 'Beloved was he, by both father and mother alike, with a great love, beyond all his brethren; yea, and the darling of all. As he grew in stature, both in childhood and boyhood, so showed he ever fairer in form than any one of them, and in looks, and words, and ways the loveliest.'

His Accession.—Thus nurtured in love, a saint in his personal habits, yet 'strong and skilled in everything', Alfred, at the age of twenty two (871), was called 'by the assent of all men' to wield the sceptre and save his country. The victory of Ashdown, followed by other battles, had caused the retirement from Wessex of the Danes, who left him in peace for four years, while they were free to work their will in East Anglia, their head quarters, Mercia, and Northumbria. London, too, remained in their hands.

Athelney; Ethandun; Peace of Chippenham.—But the heathen host, continually reinforced by new arrivals from the Continent, ever grew in strength, until in 878 it overran Wessex, and drove Alfred to take refuge in a stronghold which he made for himself in the Isle of Athelney, among the marshes formed by two little rivers of Somersetshire, and 'not to be come at save by boat' ¹ Secure in that fastness the king set himself to organize victory, and was cheered by the news of a small fight won by the men of Devon, who captured the Raven standard of the Danes. At last he succeeded in gathering men enough to strike a crushing blow. After a hard fight at Ethandun in Wiltshire, the Danes were defeated and driven back on their entrenched camp at Chippenham, where they were compelled to surrender owing to lack of provisions. The Peace of Chippenham dictated by the victor, bound the Danes to quit Wessex and required their leader Guthrum to accept baptism as a Christian. Three weeks later the Danish chief appeared at Wedmore and was duly baptized with thirty of his principal followers ².

The Danelaw; London rebuilt.—Alfred, not being strong enough to bring all England under his sway, was constrained to recognize the formal partition of the country between the Saxons and the Danes. The line of division, roughly speaking, ran from London to Chester, the regions to the north and east forming Danish territory, the Danelaw or Danelagh, while those to the south and west (comprising part of Mercia) were included in the dominions of Wessex. London fell to the share of Alfred, who (886) worshipfully restored the city of London after the burning of the place and the massacre of

¹ The only personal relic of Alfred is the famous gold and enamel locket found many years ago at Athelney, and now in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford. It bears an inscription in old English 'Alfred had me made.'

² The Peace is commonly called that of Wedmore, but, as Dr S. R. Gardiner pointed out the language of the *Chronicle* clearly means that the treaty was signed at Chippenham in Wiltshire. Wedmore is in Somersetshire.

the folk thereof, and made men to dwell therein, and made it over to the wardship of Æthelred, Alderman of Mercia'

Final Repulse of the Danes—The battle of Ethandun gave peace to Alfred's realm for many years during which the Danes devoted their attention to harrying France rather than England. But in 893 a fresh fleet, acting in concert with the settled Danes of the Danelaw, made a strong attack, which was sustained for three or four years. By 897 the wise strategy of Alfred who combined naval and military forces with masterly skill, overcame the enemy and entrapped their ships, so that 'in the summer the Host broke up, some for East Anglia and some for Northumbria. And they who were moneyless there took ship, and went southward over sea to the Seine.' 'Thanks be to God,' exclaims the chronicler, 'the Host had not utterly broken Angle-lan (England),' which suffered more in those years from a murrain among cattle and a deadly sickness among men than it did from Danish ravages.

From this time onwards for nearly a century no serious Viking invasion troubled the land, and Alfred was free for the short remainder of his life to devote his untiring energy to law making, literature, and good works.

Alfred in War—The wars of Alfred in the conduct of which he showed himself to be a brave man and a consummate commander, were purely defensive and free from all taint of grasping ambition. Their purpose of staying the torrent of savage rapine was so fully accomplished that Alfred's hard-won victories enabled his son to bring all England under his sole government. The action of the great king in devising ships of improved build and forming an adequate navy able to meet the Danes with success at sea laid the foundation of England's maritime power. The naval and military success of Alfred, attained in spite of enormous difficulties by a man who suffered during his whole life from torturing diseases, would alone justify the title of Great which all historians have been willing to grant him. He was, as his friend Asser records,




'pierced by the nails of many a sorrow' and 'incessantly worn down by the grievous attacks of an unknown malady, so that he has never known one quiet hour, wherein he is not either bearing the pang or depressed almost to despair by the dread thereof'. But his claim to the reverence of after ages rests even more securely upon other foundations. To use the words of a later chronicler, 'it is his less conspicuous life that is worthy of the greatest praise and wonder.'

Alfred in Peace—Although a few rare kings have been reputed saints it would be difficult to find the parallel of Alfred, who combined personal holiness with bodily activity, martial spirit, strategical ability, love of justice, devotion to literature, and unceasing labour in the work of government for the good of his people. He recast and revised the laws of Kent and Wessex and devoted to the execution of the laws an amount of personal energy almost incredible.

Pains likewise, took he in judgement, for the good of his folk high born and low born alike—all appealed to the king's own judgement and on either side, trusted them thereto. And no wonder—for in deciding a case as in all things else our King was a most keen searcher out of truth. For nearly every sentence given throughout the whole realm in his absence did he himself revise with all his wit whether they were righteous or unrighteous—and thus chiefly through his care for the poor to whom and to the other duties of this life he ever took special heed. For in all the whole realm, save him alone the poor had few or none to champion them.

His Love of Learning—These touching testimonies are recorded by Asser, a monk from St. David's in Wales who was summoned to Alfred's court, and became his intimate adviser and friend. The King promoted him to be Bishop of Sherbourne. All men of learning and piety, whether English or foreign, found favour with the scholar king who himself translated many books from Latin then the literary language of Europe into the English tongue and so became the father of English literature. The most notable of his translations was that of the *Ecclesiastical History of the Venerable Bede*.



ALFRED THE GREAT [Photo by H Taunt & Co
The Monument at Winchester

the learned Northumbrian monk (673-735) to whom we are so largely indebted for our knowledge of Saxon England. There is good reason to believe that the *Anglo Saxon Chronicle*, 'the oldest English history' and 'the earliest and the most venerable monument of Teutonic prose', 'began to be put together in its present shape in Alfred's time, and that it was regularly gone on with afterwards, so that from the time of Alfred onwards we have a history which was regularly written down as things happened'¹

Foreign Missions; Education.—'His mind,' Green observes, 'was far from being prisoned within his own island. He sent a Norwegian ship master to explore the White Sea, and Wulfstan to trace the coast of Lethonia, envoys bore his presents to the churches of India and Jerusalem and an annual mission carried Peter's pence' to Rome'² It was with France, however that his intercourse was closest, and it was from thence that he drew the scholars to aid him in his work of education

The king, who laboured hard to encourage the education of the young, which had been much neglected by reason of the Danish terror, founded a school in which he 'carefully gathered many of the high born of his own race', including

¹ Freeman *Old English History*, p. 132.

² *The White Sea* a land locked sea in the north of Russia accessible only by a dangerous voyage round the North Cape and through the Arctic Ocean. *Fethonia*, a province of Russia, on the south side of the Gulf of Finland, an arm of the Baltic Sea. *India*: the entry in the *Chronicle* is '883. And that same year Higelme and Athelstane bare to Rome the alms that the King had vowed to send thither, and eke [also] to India, to St. Thomas and St. Bartholomew, when they [the English] sat down against the [Danish] Host that was in London. And there, thanks be to God, was the end of that vow largely fulfilled unto them.' Tradition credited the Apostle Bartholomew with the conversion of Ararat, sometimes reckoned as part of India, and Alfred's envoys may have found a shrine dedicated to him in one of the Pal Sea ports. The shrine of St. Thomas at Malapur (Mylapore), a suburb of Madras, is well known. There is no sufficient reason to doubt that the envoys visited that spot. *Peter's Pence*, a tribute paid to the Pope (*ante*, p. 27), who claims to be the successor of St. Peter. Amer tells of the gifts sent to Jerusalem.

his children, and devoted to its support no less than one eighth of the royal revenue

Alfred and Akbar.—In his marvellous activity of body and mind and untiring interest in subjects the most various Alfred recalls to the reader of Indian history the figure of Akbar

‘Yet, all the while,’ (writes Asser) ‘the King, amid his wars, and the constant hindrances of his worldly duties, yea, and the attacks of the Heathen, and his own daily attacks of illness, never slackened or stayed in his tendance on the helm of the kingdom, and in his practice of all wood craft [hunting], nor yet in his teaching of all his goldsmiths, and his craftsmen, and his falconers and his huntsmen, nor in his construction of buildings, stately and costly beyond all the elder wont [older practice] by new plans of his own nor in his recitation of Saxon books, nor, most of all in himself learning by heart Saxon songs, with all diligence and to the utmost of his power, and bidding others do the like

Nor yet slackened he ever in attendance at Divine Service. Great too was his diligence, and great his bounty in his alms-deeds which he did, both toward them of his own land and toward incomers [visitors] from all nations. Kind of speech above all, was he beyond compare and free of wit [intelligence] toward all men. And with all his mind did he throw himself into the seeking out of things unknown’

The same unquenchable curiosity marked the temperament of Akbar. He too was a truly great king worthy to be had in remembrance, but Alfred was far nobler

Death of Alfred.—At the age of fifty two in October, 901, the dauntless, restless spirit found peace

Alfred the Truth teller, in war ever the sturdiest of heroes, noblest of the Kings of Wessex, prudent and religious and wise above all in this year, after reigning twenty nine years and a half over all England (save those parts which were under the Danes), to the grievous woe of his folk went the way of all flesh. And in the royal city of Winchester was he buried meetly [suitably] with all royal honours, in the church of St Peter the Prince of the Apostles. And there standeth his tomb, wrought of marble porphyry, most precious

Thus is the death of the King recorded by either Asser

Æthelstan.—In 925 Edward was succeeded by his son Æthelstan, who worthily sustained the honour of his royal race by defeating at a place called Brunanburgh, of which the exact position is not certainly known,¹ a league of the Scots and Danes who sought to check his advance (937). A nameless poet celebrated the victory and sang how

the King and the Ætheling [prince]

Sought their own country,
The West Saxons' land, with their war glory on them,
Leaving behind them a banquet of corpses
For the greedy war hawk, and that grey beast
The wolf of the wold [forest] Was never more slaughter
In this island, since hitherward
English and Saxons came up from the east
Over the broad sea and won this our land

The fame of Æthelstan spread over Europe so that his sisters were sought in marriage by the greatest princes of the Continent, including Otto, who became Emperor of the West, and Hugh, Duke of the Franks

The Brothers of Æthelstan—The sceptre passed from his grasp (941) to that of his brother Edmund, who carried further the subjugation of the Danes. When he was murdered (946), a third brother, Edred ascended the throne. All the kings of this period died young, and when Edred passed away (955), the people of Wessex chose his nephew Edwy as their king, while Edwy's brother Edgar became ruler of the country north of the Thames

Edgar and Archbishop Dunstan.—Four years later Edwy died and Edgar reigned alone over both North and South (959), assuming the titles of 'King of the English and all the nations round about,' 'Ruler and Lord of the whole isle of Albion,' and so forth.² At Chester, it is said that he was rowed on the river Dee by eight vassal kings. There is no afterwards passed into German and Austrian hands. The Eastern Empire lasted until 1453, when the Turks took Constantinople

¹ It is supposed to be Burnswark on the north-east side of Solway Firth.

² Albion, 'the land of the white cliffs,' is the oldest known name of Britain.

doubt that he was the most powerful of the Saxon kings, and that he was able to rule his dominions in prosperity and comparative peace, victorious alike by sea and land when fighting had to be done. He is said to have granted the northern portion of Northumbria, otherwise called Lothian, or the Lowlands of Scotland, to Kenneth, King of the Scots, to be held by him as vassal of England. Thus it came to pass that Lothian, although English in people and language, has ever since been reckoned as part of Scotland.¹ The success of Edgar's government was largely due to the ability of his minister Dunstan, Archbishop of Canterbury, who had been for a time in the service of both Æthelstan and his brother Edmund. Dunstan, although a monk, was a man of varied gifts, skilled in painting and music, and an expert in architecture, carpentry, and other crafts, as well as in the art of government.

Edward the Martyr; Æthelred the Ill counselled.—From Edgar the crown passed to his sons, first to Edward (975), known as the Martyr, because he was cruelly murdered after a short reign, and then (978) to Æthelred, nicknamed the 'Unrede' or 'Ill counselled'. During the reign of this unlucky and misguided prince the work of his great fore-runners was undone. The Danes, under the pressure of civil war and the effects of a terrible famine in Norway and Denmark, again began to ravage the coasts of England. The English people proved in several battles that, if properly led, they were well able to beat the pirates in fair fight, but the king and his counsellors failed in their duty, and adopted the fatal policy of trying to buy off the invaders. Naturally, the Danes, when they found that they could get money by threats, came again for more. In 1002, on St. Brice's day, Æthelred attempted to weaken the Danish power by ordering the massacre of all the newly settled Danes living in England, and in pursuance of his orders many of them were cruelly murdered. Such an act was not only a crime but a blunder, bound to be sternly avenged.

¹ Some authorities attribute this grant to Canute in 1018.

Edmund Ironside.—King Søren of Denmark came across the sea with many ships, and when he died (1014), his son Canute (Cnut), who continued the war, beat down the weak English defence. Early in 1016 King Æthelred was gathered to his fathers leaving behind him an evil name. For a few months the throne was occupied by his son Edmund, surnamed Ironside, a better man who fought five battles with the Danes, three of which he won. But, nevertheless, he was obliged to agree to divide the kingdom with Canute. Presently, in November, he died not without suspicion of foul play, at an early age like his predecessors, and the sceptre passing away from the Saxon dynasty of Egbert and Alfred was grasped by Dane strangers who ruled England for some twenty six years.

LEADING DATES

Accession of Alfred	871
Battle of Ethandun, Peace of Chippenham (Wedmore)	878
Lasting Peace with the Danes	897
Accession of Edward the Elder	901
Accession of Æthelstan .	925
Battle of Brunanburgh	937
Æthelstan's brothers	941
Edgar sole king	9
Æthelred the Ill-counselled	978-1016

CHAPTER V

THE DANISH KINGS. EDWARD THE CONFESSOR, HAROLD THE SON OF EARL GODWIN, BATTLE OF HASTINGS OR SLING (1017-66)

Early Acts of Canute (Cnut).—Canute, who seems to have been accepted by general consent as the only possible king, was duly crowned in St. Paul's Cathedral, London. He made it his first business to remove, either by death or exile, all the surviving members of the Saxon royal family who might be set up as claimants to the throne. He next proceeded to

mark the disappearance of the old subordinate kingdoms and to affirm the authority of his own kingship by appointing Earls (equivalent to Saxon Ealdormen) as Governors of Wessex, Mercia, East Anglia, and Northumbria. Godwin, a Saxon noble of uncertain origin, was made Earl of Wessex, and another Saxon, Leofric, Earl of Mercia. The Northumbrian and East Anglian provinces, being inhabited chiefly by Danes, were entrusted to Danish officers. The greater part of the fleet was paid off and sent back to Denmark, the English being made to pay heavily for the relief. The royal person and authority were secured by keeping up a body-guard of several thousand trained soldiers, an arrangement which greatly strengthened the growing power of the kingly office.

His Power.—Canute, who had inherited the kingdom of Denmark, with its island dependencies, also conquered and annexed Norway, with part of Sweden. King Malcolm of Scotland was compelled to acknowledge himself as the vassal of the King of England, who thus took rank as one of the most powerful sovereigns of Europe. The esteem in which he was held by foreign states is shown by the facts that his sister was married to Duke Robert of Normandy, his daughter to the German King Henry III. and he himself to Emma (also called Ælgiſu or Elgiſa), the sister of the late Duke of Normandy and widow of King Æthelred.

His Just Rule—Once he had settled down firmly in his seat on the throne Canute proved himself to be a good King of England. He published a code of laws mostly confirming the ancient customs, and seems to have ruled justly and well according to the standard of those rough times. He felt himself sufficiently secure to be able to leave his kingdom for several months (1027) and make a pilgrimage to Rome, where he met the Emperor of the West and the King of Burgundy¹. While at Rome he sent to England a manifesto

¹ Burgundy is now part of Eastern France, adjoining Switzerland. The independent kingdom came to an end soon after Canute's pilgrimage.

addressed to his people in the form of a letter to an abbot, in which, among other things, he wrote —

‘I have vowed to God Almighty Himself to amend my life from this day in all ways, and to rule with righteousness and mercy, giving upright judgements I therefore bid all my sheriffs and servants throughout my kingdom, as they care for my goodwill and their own safety, to use no unrighteous violence against any man rich or poor, but that all alike, high or low, shall enjoy fair law Nor let any man turn aside therefrom, either for the favour of the king or the power of the great, or to get money wrongfully, for I have no need to heap up wealth by unrighteousness I have sent this letter before me that my people may be gladdened by my welfare, for as ye yourselves know, I have never spared nor will I spare myself or my labour in taking care for the needs of all my people’

The king kept his word His language may be compared with that of Asoka ‘the welfare of all folk is what I must work for—and the root of that, again, is in effort and the dispatch of business’ Canute was only about forty years of age when he died in 1035

The Sons of Canute; End of Danish Dynasty.—His son Hardicanute (Harthacnut) succeeded him in Denmark and another son named Swegen in Norway In England people were divided in opinion, those of the south wishing Hardicanute to be king and those of the north preferring Harold Harefoot, a third illegitimate son by an English mother In the end Harold became King of England (1037), but his reign lasted only for some three years His brother Hardicanute then (1040) ascended the throne and reigned ill until June 1042, when he died suddenly With him the Danish dynasty came to an end

Election of Edward the Confessor.—The Lady Emma, or, Elgiva (Ælgifu), had borne two sons to her first husband, King Æthelred the Ill-counselled One of these, named Alfred, having ventured into England, had been put to death in the reign of Harold the Dane The other, named Edward,

lived safely with his mother in Normandy, and usually stayed there after her marriage with Canute. When Hardicanute died no suitable Danish candidate for the crown was available, and the great men of England could not well help electing Edward, the son of Æthelred and Emma, and so restoring the old line of Egbert and Alfred. Edward accordingly was crowned at Easter early in the following year (1043).^{*}

The English Monarchy Elective.—In reading old English history we must remember that the people possessed and used the right of electing their kings, who were chosen by the 'wise men' or notables (*wtan-gemōt*), assembled in council; a member of the royal family being selected invariably, with two exceptions only, namely, Canute, and Harold, son of Godwin. The reign was not considered to begin legally until the king had been crowned, or to use the old term 'hallowed', that is to say, consecrated. The current doctrine that 'the king never dies', and that consequently the heir succeeds *instantly* at the moment of his predecessor's decease, dates only from the time of Edward VI (1547).¹ The ceremonies of a modern coronation still recognize in a purely formal way the ancient practice of election.

Reign of Edward the Confessor.—The epithet of 'the Confessor' by which this king is distinguished from earlier Saxon Edwards is nearly equivalent to 'saint'. Edward was very religious and within a century after his death was actually 'canonized', that is to say, decreed by the Pope to rank as a saint. He founded the noble Abbey of Westminster, and was just able to complete it before he died, but the building as it stands shows little of his work, and dates for the most part from the thirteenth century. Edward, having been brought up in Normandy, was more French than English in his tastes, and during the earlier years of his reign gave great offence to his subjects by promoting Normans to

¹ Edward I (1272) was recognized by the barons as king on the day of his father's funeral, four days after the death of Henry III, without waiting for his coronation.

important and well paid offices over the heads of Englishmen. Earl Godwin, who resisted this policy, was obliged to quit England for a time, but came back, and after his death the government was mainly in the capable hands of his son Harold, a man of great personal courage and high character. He gained victories over the Keltic chiefs of Wales and came to terms with rebels in Northumbria, assenting to the banishment of his brother Tostig. At the beginning of 1066 (January 5) King Edward died, having reigned for more than twenty-three years, and earned a high reputation for piety rather than more kingly qualities. The memory of Edward, the last of the long line of native Saxon kings, was cherished and revered by the English after they had been compelled to pass under the yoke of a foreign invader, the fate which befell them within nine months of 'the Confessor's' death.

Harold the Son of Earl Godwin.—No suitable prince being available, the 'wise men' were obliged for a second time to elect an outsider as king, and could feel no doubt that Harold, the son of Earl Godwin, was the fittest person to choose. He had practically ruled the kingdom for years, and, although not of the blood royal, was connected with the royal house by the marriage of his sister to the late king. Accordingly, Harold was elected, and if fate had given him the chance, there is every reason to believe that he would have governed England well. But from the first he was threatened both by his discontented brother Tostig, and by his cousin William, Duke of Normandy. William declared, whether truly or falsely it is hard to say, that King Edward had promised him the throne of England, and that Harold had not only promised, but sworn in the most solemn manner to support his claim to succeed the Confessor. It is obvious that the duke had no right as a member of the English royal family, and equally plain that the people had not elected him. But, nevertheless, he determined to enforce his claim such as it was, and was lucky enough to secure the support of the Pope,

a great matter in those days. He began to collect a large fleet and army for the invasion of England, gathering hired adventurers from all parts in addition to the troops of his duchy. Harold made active preparations to prevent his landing and watched the coast for months. But the delay was so long that his forces, a mere militia of country people, except the small permanent bodyguard, melted away and went home. Just then, Tostig, King Harold's exiled brother,



ENGLISH AXE MAN 1066
Bayeux Tapestry




NORMAN HORSE MAN, 1066
Bayeux Tapestry

combined with Harold Hardrada, King of Norway, to attack the north of England and the king was obliged to hurry away to meet the new danger. The English being gallantly and wisely led, utterly defeated the invaders at Stamford Bridge in Yorkshire, killing both Tostig and the Norwegian king (September 25). While King Harold was thus occupied in the north the southern coast had been unavoidably left unguarded, so that Duke William with a powerful army was able to cross the Channel unopposed and take up a fortified position at Hastings. Harold hurried back as fast as he could, but local jealousies prevented the men of the north from

helping him, and he had to trust to his southerners to resist the superior force of the Norman

Battle of Hastings or Senlac, Oct. 14, 1066.—Harold took up a strong, well-chosen position on a low hill at Senlac, near Hastings, giving orders that it should be defended to the last, and that no man should leave his post. The fight raged from nine in the morning until nightfall, and promised to end in an English victory. Unluckily, however, some of the English men were tempted to pursue the Normans in the plain when they pretended to fly. The attacking force then turned on their pursuers, secured a footing on the hill, and broke down the resistance of Harold's gallant bodyguard, who died to a man in defence of their king and the Dragon Standard of England. Harold fell wounded in the eye by an arrow, and was instantly hacked to death. The remains of his army dispersed leaving William master of the field and of southern England.



NORWEGIAN AXE
From the Gokstadt
Grave mounds

Arms of the Combatants—In this famous and decisive battle sometimes called that of Senlac, but better known by the name of Hastings, the English all fought on foot the better armed troops relying chiefly on heavy Norwegian axes wielded by their strong arms with terrible effect. The Normans trusted largely to their horsemen in armour and their archers. In the battles of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, as we shall see the English victories over the French were mainly due to the deadly shooting of the English bowmen, but in Harold's time the long bow was little used by the English, who learned its value afterwards from the southern Welsh.

The Bayeux Tapestry—We know all about the weapons used at Hastings from the contemporary Bayeux Tapestry, a long narrow strip of needle work wrought in woollen thread (214 feet by 20 inches), and divided into seventy two

pictures representing the battle and the incidents which led to it. That famous work was presented to the cathedral of Bayeux in Normandy and is still to be seen in the Library Museum of that town. A full sized copy is exhibited at the South Kensington Museum London.

Coronation of William—William as soon as he could after the battle marched upon London the citizens of which had proclaimed the boy Edgar the Ætheling or Prince a grandson of King Edmund Ironside as their sovereign. But all possible leaders of the English had been destroyed and when the victor appeared before the gates of London the city and the prince were compelled to submit to irresistible force.

On Christmas Day William was elected and crowned King of England at the Confessor's new church of Westminster, and England became a dependency of the Duchy of Normandy. So far the conqueror had gained actual possession of only the south-eastern corner of the island. In the next chapter we shall see how he mastered the other provinces and became in deed as well as in name King of England.

LEADING DATES

Accession of Canute (Cnut)	1017
Canute's sons	1035-42
Accession of Edward the Confessor (crowned 1043)	1042
Accession of Harold, son of Earl Godwin	Jan., 1066
Battle of Stamford Bridge	Sept 25 1066
Battle of Hastings (Senlac)	Oct 14 1066
Coronation of William the Conqueror	Dec 25 1066

BOOK II

THE EARLY NORMAN AND ANGEVIN KINGS; HENRY III,
1066-1272


CHAPTER VI

THE EARLY NORMAN KINGS, WILLIAM THE CONQUEROR
TO STEPHEN, 1066-1154

Conquest of England, 1066-70.—William, secure in the possession of London and Wessex rapidly pushed on westward, subduing even Cornwall. Next he mastered Warwick and the Midlands, and finally Northumbria and the north. The English provinces, failing to combine, were subdued one by one. The northerners resisted stoutly and massacred a large force of Normans at York. Their punishment was awful. William's soldiers laid waste in the most literal sense most of Yorkshire, slaying men, women, children, and cattle, and destroying even the farm implements, so that the country remained desolate and uninhabited for many years. Before the summer of 1070 he had become really master of the whole of England, save one spot. Ely in the eastern fens, where a brave Saxon, Hereward the Wake held out for a year or so. But his resistance too was beaten down, and he had to take service with the Conqueror.

Confiscation and Castles.—William, claiming to be the lawful successor of Edward the Confessor, treated as rebels all persons who had supported or fought for Harold, and confiscated their lands, which he gave to his own followers. But he took care, as a rule, not to give any one Norman too much land in one place, dividing his grants over many counties so that the grantee should not become too powerful. On the borders, however, he found it necessary to establish strong, compact lordships, and so formed the 'Counties Palatine' of Chester, Durham, and Kent, to guard the kingdom against

the Welsh, Scots, and French respectively.¹ The Norman grip on the land was secured by the building of many castles, of which the White Tower in the Tower of London may be taken as the finest example.² The great earldoms of Saxon



and Danish times ceased to exist and the smaller earls found their power checked by the sheriffs (shire-reeves), who were officers appointed directly by the king.

Feudal System; Forests—The old Saxon freeholder was no longer recognized, and all land was treated as belonging

¹ 'Palatine,' with royal rights, as of the king in his palace (Latin *palatium*). The Count Palatine was a high officer of the revived Roman empire.

² Most of William's castles were of a much rougher kind.

to the king. If held by a private person, it was considered to be a grant or fief given by the king on condition of homage, or formal personal submission, and military service. The great lords sublet their fiefs on similar terms. This system is known as the Feudal System. The king, however, took care that all the grantees should swear allegiance and do homage to him directly as well as to their several immediate lords. He further kept large domains in his own hands, and reserved broad tracts as forests for his hunting, like the *ramnās* of India. The New Forest in Hampshire was thus reserved in William's reign, and any serious breach of the forest laws was punished with death, just as in ancient India Chandragupta Maurya inflicted the same penalty for disturbing his sport. William made use of the sheriffs and other old officials of Saxon times as far as possible, and consulted the Great Council of notables. But he relied greatly on his own strict personal supervision and worked hard.

The Church.—The Church was reformed on lines arranged so as to increase still more the royal power. English bishops and abbots were replaced by foreigners, who were the king's servants, and special church courts were formed for the disposal of causes connected with the interests of the Church and public morals. It is to William's credit that most of the alien churchmen whom he selected for high office were fit persons; notably Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury, was such. Besides the churchmen, large numbers of other foreigners settled in England for business purposes, including many Jews, who supplied the capital needed for the development of trade and industry.

Domesday Book.—The result of all these changes was peace under a strong central government, harsh in its methods, but aiming at justice. The Danish raids ceased, and all attempts at rebellion were crushed. The royal power of taxation was furthered by the compilation (1085, 1086) of Domesday Book, a wonderfully accurate and detailed survey of every estate in England (excluding the four most northern counties and

part of Lancashire), giving full particulars of the people, land tenures, cattle, and value¹. When the survey was finished William summoned a great assembly (*gemôt*) of landholders to meet at Salisbury, where everybody had to take an oath of allegiance to him personally.

Death and Character of William—Next year, at the age of sixty, he died from the effects of an accident at Mantes in France, where he was fighting the French king. All through his life he had been 'the strong man armed', a born king of men, ambitious, fearless, relentless, and impartial, a just tyrant, and, in his way, religious.

William Rufus.—The Conqueror left three surviving sons—Robert, William, nicknamed Rufus, or the Red, and Henry. To Robert, the eldest, he bequeathed the Duchy of Normandy, including Maine which he himself had annexed, while to Henry, the youngest and ablest, he gave a sum of money. William hastened over to England to claim the crown, which with the help of Archbishop Lanfranc, his father's counsellor, he obtained. An attempted invasion by Robert was repelled. During his short reign William Rufus showed no fear of God or man, and acted as a faithless, greedy, unscrupulous oppressor. Anselm, the saintly Archbishop of Canterbury, the successor of Lanfranc, tried to stay the hand of the wicked king, but in vain, and was obliged to retire to Rome. Notwithstanding his oppressions the king could count on the help of the English against the great Norman barons who were even worse than himself. With English support he was able to suppress the revolt of the Earl of Northumberland, and to recover from the Scots the county of Cumberland which had been granted to them by Æthelstan's brother Edmund in 945. The king's arms also won considerable success in Wales. William regained Normandy for a time in a curious way. His brother Robert was eager to join the First Crusade, an expedition organized by the Pope for

¹ By a curious coincidence, 1086 is the date of the revised revenue survey carried out in Southern India by the Chola king, Kulottunga I.

the purpose of freeing Jerusalem and the holy places of the Christian faith from the hands of the Muhammadan Turks. Without money he could not go, and the only method by which he could obtain the needful funds was by pledging or mortgaging his Duchy to William. Jerusalem was taken by the Crusaders in 1099, and Robert soon afterwards started for home. On August 2, 1100, King William, who had been hunting in the New Forest (*ante*, p 55), was found in the evening lying dead, pierced by an arrow. No man could tell for certain who shot him, but in all likelihood he was slain on purpose by some nameless victim of his tyranny¹. He was buried at Winchester, and there was none to mourn him.

Henry I and his brother Robert.—When the Red King died Robert was still on his travels, but Henry was on the spot and within three days managed to have himself elected King of England. Robert arrived too late, and for lack of support was obliged to forgo his claim to the crown. Henry proceeded to make himself master in his own house, and struck terror into the hearts of the Norman barons by subduing and exiling the worst of them, one Robert of Bellême, Earl of Shrewsbury. The differences between Henry and his brother were finally settled by a battle at Tinchebrai in Normandy (1106), which resulted in the utter defeat by English troops of Robert, who passed the twenty eight years of life remaining to him as a prisoner in the castle of Cardiff in Wales. Thus the Duchy of Normandy came again under the rule of the King of England, and the shame of Hastings was avenged.

Fusion of English and Normans.—Henry, immediately after his accession, had strengthened his position by marrying Edith (also known by her Norman name of Matilda or Maud), the daughter of Malcolm, King of the Scots and his queen, Margaret, a granddaughter of Edmund Ironside. The Norman dynasty thus formed a second connexion with the ancient

¹ According to some writers he was accidentally shot by Walter Tyrril. Dr Gardiner is followed in the text.

Saxon kings the first having been effected by William the Conqueror's marriage to Matilda descended from a daughter of Alfred the Great. The fusion of the native English with the foreign Normans so as to form one undivided English nation which went on during the long reign of Henry I is the really important event of his time. Intermarriages now became common. English parents began to give Norman names to their children and the Norman settlers learned to speak the tongue of their adopted land which gradually grew into the rich copious language used to-day, a sturdy Anglo-Saxon stock grafted with scions of Latin origin—words carrying the traditions and ideas of old Rome.

Growth of Towns—Nothing is more distinctive of later English life than the development of the self-government of the towns. The Roman forms of town administration had been all but wholly destroyed by the Saxons and Danes and the wild northerners were slow to adopt the city mode of life (*ante* p. 28). But gradually they worked out their own system of local self government while the towns slowly won liberties and the right of managing their own affairs from kings, barons, bishops and abbots. The grant by Henry I of a charter to the city of London (about 1133) giving the citizens various privileges was the beginning of a long series of similar grants.¹ Normans and 'true-born Englishmen' shared in the labour of constructing bit by bit the new system of town government. The records prove that many traders from France who settled at this period in London, Norwich, and other towns quickly became English citizens. For instance Gilbert Beket of Rouen was appointed Portreeve, or chief magistrate of London and thus was the official ancestor of the long line of lord mayors. His son was the famous Archbishop Thomas.

Religion and Learning—At the same time a marked religious revival was in progress fostered by two orders of monks the

¹ An earlier charter confirming the rights enjoyed in the time of the Confessor had been granted by William the Conqueror.

Benedictines and the stricter Cistercians, as a result of which noble churches begun to arise all over the country, built in the Norman style of architecture, based on Roman models, which possesses singular grandeur and dignity. King Henry himself, more learned than most of the fighting princes of his age, and known accordingly as 'Beauclerc', or 'the Scholar', was able to sympathize with the efforts of the monks to promote learning. In those rough days learning could not live unless it donned the garb of religion, and the only libraries were in the monasteries.

Origin of Courts of Law.—Henry's vigorous reign is further memorable as marking the origin of the modern courts of law. A special body of councillors appointed by the King became the King's Court (Latin *Curia Regis*), from which in course of time were developed the Privy Council as well as the Courts of King's Bench, Exchequer, Common Pleas and Chancery. The Chancellor originally was a secretary, not a judge. Henry was the first king to send some of the judges on tour or circuit into distant parts of the kingdom, and so to make the local courts feel the presence of the royal authority. Such circuits are continued to this day. All these arrangements, which at first combined revenue with judicial business, tended to curb the power of the feudal barons and to add strength to the central government. As a matter of fact, Henry exercised practically absolute power, like an Asiatic king, without much check from any other authority. But he professed to act under 'the laws of Edward the Confessor', and ordered that the local courts should be held regularly.

Death of Henry I, 1135—The latter days of the king were saddened by the loss of his only lawful son, William, who was drowned in a shipwreck on the coast of Normandy. Henry persuaded the notables of the kingdom to promise allegiance to his only other child, ~~born at wedlock~~, the Empress Matilda, widow of the Germanic Emperor, Henry V, who had married Geoffrey Plantagenet, heir to the Count of Anjou, as her second husband, and to whom she had borne (1133) a son.

destined to become Henry II of England On December 1, 1135, Henry I died, aged sixty seven

Stephen and Matilda; Civil War.—When Henry passed away Matilda was abroad, whereas Stephen, Count of Blois, son of the Conqueror's daughter Adela, and consequently nephew of the late king was at hand The nobles refused to be bound by their promises to Henry, and declaring that they could not bear the rule of a woman elected Stephen king and caused him to be crowned at London The rivalry between Matilda who continued to hold Normandy, and Stephen led to prolonged civil war, involving England for nineteen years in unutterable misery, worse, perhaps even than that caused by the Saxon or Danish invasions or that wrought by the Pindaris in India a century ago Sometimes Stephen, and sometimes Matilda was recognized as sovereign, but in either case the people suffered equally The *Anglo Saxon Chronicle* (*ante*, p 33) ends with the reign of Stephen The writer depicts the wretchedness of the kingdom in a passage often quoted, for part of which only have we space —

‘Every nobleman made him a castle and held it against the king and filled the land full of castles They put the wretched country folk to sore toil with their castle building, and when the castles were made they filled them with devils and evil men Then they took all those that they deemed had any goods, both by night and day men and women alike and put them in prison to get their gold and silver, and tortured them with tortures unspeakable, for never were martyrs so tortured as they were Such, and more than we can say, we suffered nineteen winters for our sins’

Battle of the Standard, 1137—The only incident in the miserable war which need be specified is the defeat of the Scots king an ally of Matilda at Northallerton in Yorkshire (1137) which is known to historians as the Battle of the Standard, because the English army displayed a great standard bearing the banners of three saints of local renown In spite of the victory Stephen was obliged to leave Northumberland

and Cumberland in the hands of the Scots King. The Danes made a raid for the last time in 1153, and ravaged parts of Yorkshire.

Peace of Wallingford; Death of Stephen.—In that year Matilda's son Henry landed in England, and the war was ended by a peace made at Wallingford on the Thames, securing the throne to Stephen for life, and the succession to Count Henry. Next year Stephen died, aged about sixty years. As a man he was estimable, and in the Roman historian's phrase, would have been judged fit for government if he had not been called to govern. The times were too hard for him, and he failed tragically. 'In his days was nought but war and wickedness and waste.'

LEADING DATES

Conquest of England	1066-70
Compilation of Domesday Book	1085, 1086
Accession of William II, Rufus	1087
Accession of Henry I 'Beauclerc'	1100
Battle of Tinchebrai, recovery of Normandy by the king of England	1106
Charter granted to London	1133
Stephen and Matilda civil war	1135-54
Battle of the Standard	1137
Peace of Wallingford, last Danish raid	1153
Death of Stephen	1154

CHAPTER VII

HENRY II (OF ANJOU) AND HIS SONS, 1154-1216

Accession of Henry II—When Henry, the son of Matilda and Geoffrey of Anjou, was crowned King of England in December, 1154, he was a young man of twenty-one years of age, and already, in virtue of his great possessions, one of the most powerful sovereigns in western Europe. On behalf of his mother he ruled Normandy, from his father he inherited

Anjou, Maine, and Touraine, and by his marriage with Eleanor, the divorced queen of Louis VII of France he was lord of the Duchy of Aquitaine, including Poitou and Gascony. He was thus master of all western France, except Brittany, which province he acquired a few years later (1166). The addition of the realm of England to his wide continental dominion raised Henry to a position of commanding importance¹. Soon after his accession he recovered from the Scots the counties of Northumberland and Cumberland, never again to be separated from England (*ante*, p. 60).

His Energy.—His continental possessions naturally occupied a large share of the attention of the king, who spent more than half of his reign in France, and was much concerned with the political affairs of the Continent. But he cannot be accused of neglecting England, the value of which he fully understood. His energy, bodily and mental, was so great that he could never keep still and, except towards the end of his life, he was fully equal to the task of governing both England and his French dominions. His attempt (1159) to add Toulouse in the south of France to his other lordships, it is true, failed, but the failures in his busy, strenuous life were few.

Restoration of Order in England.—In England Henry's first and urgent business was to restore order after nineteen years of anarchy. Aided by wise counsellors Archbishop Theobald,

¹ **The Plantagenets.**—Many historians write of the 'Plantagenet kings'. Henry's father, Geoffrey, Count of Anjou, wore as a personal badge a sprig of the 'broom' shrub (Latin *planta genista*), and so was known as Plantagenet. The epithet became a sort of surname for his descendants. Usually the Plantagenet line of kings is taken to end with Richard II (1399), the houses of Lancaster and York being considered distinct. But some authors include those dynasties among the Plantagenets, to the battle of Bosworth (1485). Bacon, for instance, when recording the execution by Henry VII of the Yorkist Earl of Warwick, eldest son of the Duke of Clarence, describes the victim as 'this noble and comely person, the end . . . of the line male of the Plantagenets, which had flourished in great royalty and renown, from the time of the famous King of England, King Henry the second. Howbeit it was a race often dipped in their own blood.'

Thomas Becket (Becket), the Chancellor, son of Gilbert, Portreeve of London (*ante*, p 58),¹ and others, the king destroyed hundreds of castles and brought the robber barons into subjection. The coinage, too, which had become irregular and debased during the civil war, was now reformed and made the same throughout the kingdom, a measure specially provided for by the Peace of Wallingford. Henry further checked the power of the nobles by accepting a cash payment (*scutage*) in lieu of the military service of knights, and thus acquiring funds wherewith to pay hired foreign troops entirely at his disposal. His main aim in short, was to continue and extend the policy of his grandfather Henry I, by reducing the authority of the feudal barons and enhancing that of the crown.

Repression of the Barons and Clergy—In pursuance of that policy the king reorganized the ancient Anglo Saxon militia (*fyrð*), requiring universal military service from all freemen, without regard to their obligations to feudal lords, and largely extended the operation of the king's courts as distinguished from the local courts of the barons. The clergy also were brought partially under the control of the Crown by a code called the 'Constitutions of Clarendon' (1164), which, however, he had to withdraw eight years later. He failed in his attempt to subject ecclesiastics guilty of crimes to the royal authority but succeeded in some minor matters.

Rebellion of the Barons—The nobles who naturally resented the king's action rose against him in 1173 and 1174, supported by the kings of France and Scotland, and two of Henry's rebellious sons. But with the help of the English militia the rebellion was suppressed, and the Scots king was taken prisoner.

¹ The use of inherited family surnames such as Becket, began in the twelfth and became common in the fourteenth century. In India a similar process may be observed in Bengal where Dutt, Gupta, Mookerjee, and other epithets or titles are gradually becoming surnames after the English fashion.

Rebellious Sons ; Death of the King.—Henry had four lawful sons, Henry, Geoffrey, Richard, and John¹. His fatherly affection and kindness met only with ingratitude and rebellion from all four, who behaved in a manner exactly the same as that of the sons of Shahjahan. Henry had sought to secure the position of his eldest son by having him crowned as king (like an Indian *uparaja*) during his own lifetime, but the honour merely had the effect of inducing the young man to rebel and claim the throne. Henry the young king and Geoffrey died before their father, whose last days were rendered miserable by the revolt of Richard, abetted by John the favourite son. Their final rebellion in 1189 when the king's health was failing crushed his spirit, and left him 'nothing to care for in the world', so that at the age of fifty-six he was glad to turn his face to the wall and die.

Quarrel with and Murder of Thomas Becket.—Having thus pointed out the significance of the reign of Henry II, and sketched his relations with his sons and foreign powers, we proceed to describe certain events in more detail. During the first eight years of his rule Henry employed Thomas Becket as his Chancellor or Secretary. Thomas, although an ordained clergyman, lived practically the life of a layman, and even took an active part in the French wars². The king, thinking that he would have in his Chancellor an officer willing and able to control the clergy in the interest of the Crown, insisted (1162) on making him Archbishop of Canterbury. He soon discovered his mistake. Thomas, once he was installed as head of the English Church, cast away all his layman's habits of life, adopted ascetic practices so as to gain the reputation of a saint, and stood forth as the unbending champion of the Pope and the clergy. He gave an unwilling

¹ A natural son of Henry II by 'Fair Rosamond' was also named Geoffrey, and became Archbishop of York. He was always dutiful to his father.

² Thomas did not receive full ordination as a priest until just before his consecration as Archbishop. Up to that time he was only a 'deacon'.

assent, afterwards retracted, to the 'Constitutions of Clarendon' (1164) which, among other things, subjected criminal clergymen to civil jurisdiction, freed laymen from the control of the church courts set up by the Conqueror (*ante*, p 55), and prohibited appeals to Rome, except by leave of the king. The Archbishop, in consequence of his opposition to Henry's policy,* was obliged to quit England and remain in Flanders and France for six years. In 1170 the king had Prince Henry crowned as under king by the Archbishop of York, but Thomas, who had been allowed to return to England, took offence at this and excommunicated various persons concerned in the business¹. The king, a hot tempered man, became enraged at this defiance and uttered hasty words, which four knights who heard them took to be sufficient authority for killing the Archbishop. Accordingly they murdered him brutally in the cathedral (1170). All Europe was shocked at the crime. Henry was obliged to disavow any share in it and to do humble penance at the tomb of Thomas who became the most popular saint of England, and was formally canonized, or declared to be a saint, by the Pope.

Annexation of Brittany.—During Thomas Becket's exile Henry had made himself master of Brittany by forcing a marriage between his son Geoffrey, a boy seven years old, and the infant daughter of the Duke of Brittany. When the Duke died the King of England took charge of the Duchy, nominally on behalf of his son and daughter in law. Marriages between children of tender years such as are now usual in India, were common among the royal and noble families of Europe for many ages down to the seventeenth century, and took place occasionally, perhaps, at a later date.

¹ Excommunication means the exclusion of the offender from all communion with the Church. In days when the influence of the clergy was powerful the penalty was much dreaded. The person excommunicated could not have his children baptized or his daughters married, and suffered many other inconveniences besides the terror of damnation in the next world.

Partial Conquest of Ireland, 1171, 1172 —Early in his reign Henry had planned the conquest of Ireland, and had obtained from the Pope a 'bull' or decree authorizing the enterprise. The Pope justified his interference on the grounds that the Irish Church did not obey Roman rules, that the Irish kidnapped Englishmen as slaves, and that all islands as such were subject to the disposal of the Pope. The king, having other things to do, let Ireland alone until 1166 when Dermot, King of Leinster, applied to him for help. Richard Strongbow, Earl of Pembroke, was allowed to go over on his own account in 1169 to help Dermot against his enemies¹. Strongbow, with his knights and Welsh archers (*ante*, p. 51) although few in number, was too powerful for the half savage and ill armed Irish clans and even for the more formidable Danes settled in Dublin, Wexford, and other towns. In a short time he had mastered most of the eastern part of the island, and had married King Dermot's daughter so as to secure for himself the succession to the little kingdom of Leinster. Henry, not wishing his barons to set up an independent power in Ireland, landed at Waterford in 1171, supported by a large army and fleet. His authority was not disputed. Both Strongbow and most of the native chiefs did homage, while English and Norman adventurers seized nearly half the land of Ireland. At a synod held at Cashel in 1172 the Irish bishops submitted to the authority of the Pope, and ever since have continued in obedience.

Evils resulting from it —But the partial conquest of the island so easily effected, and the forcible occupation of a large part of the land by foreigners, became the root of many evils which are felt acutely to this day. The native Irish, chiefly Kelts by race, and speaking a Keltic tongue akin to the Gaelic of the Scotch Highlands (*ante*, p. 10), were divided

¹ The contemporary chronicler Giraldus Cambrensis, says that the earl received 'a kind of permission from the king given in jest rather than in earnest'. When the king later distinctly forbade the expedition the earl took no notice.

into many clans or tribes, somewhat like the tribes on the Afghan frontier, engaged in constant rude war one with the other, and living in a rough, semi barbarous fashion¹ The tribes were grouped under five kings (Rajas, as they would be called in India)—those of Leinster, Munster, Ulster, Meath, and Connaught—who from time to time acknowledged the vague supremacy of one among their number, like that of the Saxon Bretwalda (*ante*, p 29) or an Indian *Maharaja dhiraja* The tribes were governed by a peculiar system of law, hard for strangers to understand, and totally unlike any English or Norman system When English and Norman settlers thrust themselves and their notions into this alien society and at the same time robbed the people of their land, trouble was bound to come The real conquest of Ireland was deferred to the time of Henry VIII and his successors, when it was slowly accomplished with such ferocity that vivid memories of the cruel struggle have never faded, and the smooth surface of modern life in Ireland is still liable to be disturbed by half hidden fires of land hunger, racial dislike, and religious hatred The majority of the Irish, unlike the English, have always remained, since the Synod of Cashel, devoted to the Roman Catholic form of the Christian religion, and have usually rendered ready obedience to the Pope of Rome

Henry's Internal Reforms.—After the suppression of the revolt of the barons (1173, 1174) and the defeat of their French and Scotch allies, including the king's rebellious sons (1175), Henry enjoyed about eight years of peace and prosperity which he devoted to internal reforms He was at that time admitted to be the most powerful prince of Western Europe, and was able to marry his daughters to the Kings of Castile and Sicily, and Henry the Lion, Duke of Saxony.² Henry now passed through his Great Council many ordinances

¹ This statement is true, although it is also true that there was more civilized life in the Irish towns than is usually admitted

² Not quite the same as modern Saxony

('assizes', as they were then called) or brief codes, dealing with various subjects

The principal of these 'assizes' was that of Clarendon which established a mode of trial, from which the modern system of grand and petty juries has grown. The supplementary Assize of Northampton dealt with the judges' circuits (*ante*, p. 59), and other measures regulated military service and forest law. The king revised and extended the judicial system of his grandfather, and enlarged the powers of the royal courts at the expense of the feudal lords' courts. Henry II is justly regarded as one of the greatest of English kings. The modern structure of English law and government rests mainly on the foundations laid by Henry I, Henry II and Edward I.

The fusion or melting of Normans and English into one people (*ante*, p. 58) continued during the reign of Henry II. Literature and learning made progress, many excellent histories being written, and towards the end of the century the beginnings of the University of Oxford may be faintly traced.

The Third Crusade ¹—Some time before the death of Henry II news had reached Europe that the Christian force settled in Palestine, or the Holy Land, since the First Crusade (*ante*, p. 56) had been defeated, and that Jerusalem had been taken by the Musalman Sultan of Syria and Egypt, commonly known as Saladin, his real name being Salah ud din Yusuf son of Ayyub. The news caused great excitement, and a new crusade (the third) was resolved on by the Pope of Rome and the sovereigns of western Europe. King Henry himself had expressed a desire to join the expedition and had levied a special tax to meet the expense, but was unable to go. After his death the preparations were continued.

Accession of Richard I, 1189—Richard, who succeeded to his father's dominions without opposition, was crowned as

¹ The Second Crusade (1147) a French and German affair in which England had no share was a gigantic failure.

King of England at Westminster on September 3 1189. But he cared nothing for England except as a treasury from which to draw revenue raised by oppressive taxes. His heart was in the crusading adventure and he left England for France in December. In the course of his reign of ten years he spent only seven months in England leaving the affairs of the kingdom to be managed by deputies, called Justiciars. Luckily they were able men, and governed the country if not well at least better than the king was likely to have done, although they were forced to extort large sums of money by all sorts of tyrannical devices in order to pay for his adventurous freaks. Richard can hardly be regarded as a king of England at all.



CIVIL COSTUME c 1200
Sloane MSS 1975

Adventures of Richard — King Philip Augustus of France and the Germanic Emperor Frederick Barbarossa both joined personally in the crusade but the latter never reached his goal having been accidentally drowned in Asia Minor. The French and English kings arrived in Palestine and could have retaken Jerusalem but for quarrels among the crusaders. Saladin ultimately agreed to allow the Christians access to the holy places. Richard met with exciting adventures throughout and when trying to reach home across the Continent in disguise was captured and then imprisoned by the emperor who would not let him go until he had paid £100 000 ransom a huge sum in those days which was extorted from the English people. His adventures although interesting do not concern the history of England and must be passed over without further notice. An attractive version of some of them may be read in Sir Walter Scott's novel *The Talisman*. Richard

was mortally wounded in April 1199 while attacking a castle in France

Some Events of the Reign — Richard and his deputies were troubled at times by the treacherous hostility of the king's brother John, and were often engaged in war with France. Immediately after Richard's coronation the popular hatred of the Jews caused several horrible outrages and massacres. The worst occurred at York, where the Jews took refuge in



A



B

CHAIN ARMOUR

A. From effigy of William Marshall Earl of Pembroke d 1231 (*Temple Ch.*).

B. From second Great Seal of Richard I.

the castle and when no hope remained were forced to put their wives and children to death and then kill themselves.

Character of Richard — Richard Professor York Powell writes

' was tall stalwart and handsome fair haired and blue-eyed. No mean general a skilful engineer and a wise judge of men. He might have made a good king but contented himself with being a good knight. Of reckless bravery he would peril his life for the sake of adventure as when he fought with a mob of peasants about a hawk in Italy and in the Holy Land his place was ever in the foremost trench at sieges and

the first ranks in battle. . . . Fond of show and pleasure, and a poet himself, he was bountiful to poets.'

He was known as Cœur-de-Lion, the lion-hearted, and deserved the epithet.

John and Arthur of Brittany.—Richard having left no legitimate children, two persons only could claim to succeed him, namely, his elder brother Geoffrey's son, Arthur, Duke of Brittany, a boy twelve years old, and Richard's younger brother John. The English barons had no hesitation in choosing John, the grown man, rather than the child. This occasion, the student should note, was the last on which the old principle of election of the fittest member of the royal family was openly acted on. The barons made an ill choice, everybody being now agreed that John proved to be the worst of the English kings. The chief events of his infamous reign were the loss of Normandy and all the English possessions in France except Gascony; a bitter quarrel with the Pope, followed by abject submission, and the extortion of the Great Charter (*Magna Carta*) from the unwilling king by a league of indignant barons. Arthur, the young Duke of Brittany, was secretly murdered at Rouen in April 1203, no doubt by his uncle's order. A poet's view of the crime is given in Shakespeare's play, *King John*.

Loss of Normandy.—It is not easy to understand at first sight John's motive in allowing the French king to make an easy and almost unopposed conquest of Normandy. In the beginning of the war John stayed at Rouen, the Norman capital, feasting and making merry while the enemy took town after town and castle after castle. Then he made a well-planned but ill-executed effort to relieve Château-Grillard, the famous fortress on the Seine built by Richard, and when that failed, sailed away to England leaving Normandy to its fate. By the end of 1204, Guienne and Gascony in the south, forming parts of the Duchy of Aquitaine, were the only French territory on the mainland left in the possession of the King of England. The Channel

Islands, however, continued to be held by him. A half-hearted attempt made in 1206 to recover the lost province had no success, and it remained in French hands until Henry V won it back more than two centuries later. John's failure to hold Normandy seems to have been partly due to the fact that he was by descent an Angevin, Count of Anjou, a province divided from Normandy by 'a century of the bitterest hate'. The Normans could not bear to be subject to the Count of Anjou, a feudatory of France like their own duke but could submit without loss of dignity to the government of King Philip, the admitted overlord of both Anjou and Normandy. According to Mr Green 'it was the consciousness of this temper in the Norman people that forced John to abandon all hope of resistance on the failure of his attempt to relieve Château Gaillard'. Whether that be so or not the King of England certainly lost northern France. His English barons refused to fight for the Duchy and henceforward the king had to look to his island kingdom as the main source of his strength, while his nobles had to be content to give all their attention to their English estates. Guienne and Gascony, the parts of Aquitaine retained, were too distant to have much effect on English policy.

Quarrel with Pope Innocent III—At the beginning of the thirteenth century the Pope was Innocent III, a man of high character and strong will who succeeded beyond any of his forerunners or successors in asserting the authority of the head of the Church over kings and princes as well as over the clergy of all European lands. In 1205 the Archbishop of Canterbury having died the local monks elected a successor. The king, disapproving their choice nominated another person, and sent the case to Rome for final decision. Pope Innocent, assuming a power to which he had no right appointed a third party, Cardinal Stephen Langton who personally was well qualified. Out of this business a long quarrel arose. King John would not allow Stephen Langton to enter England,

The Pope replied by laying the kingdom under an 'interdict', with the effect that no religious ceremony or worship could be celebrated, and incited King Philip of France to attack and expel John. In 1213 John, without the knowledge of his barons, secretly agreed to be the vassal of the Pope, who then cancelled his orders supporting the French king. At the same time the French fleet was destroyed by an English one, and the danger of invasion was removed.

Battle of Bouvines ; Revolt of the Barons ; Magna Carta.—John planned to take revenge upon France by forming a league with Otho IV, the Germanic Emperor, and other dukes and counts. The allied army, however, was utterly defeated by the French at Bouvines now included in the kingdom of Belgium (1214). This defeat stopped John from all further attempts to recover the lost provinces in France, and sent him back to England a beaten and angry man.¹ When he tried to punish his barons for failure to support him in the war they banded themselves against him and his foreign hired troops, with the aid of which he sought to oppress nobles and common folk alike. John thought it prudent to give in, and so met a committee of the barons at Runnymede, on an island in the Thames on June 15, 1215, where he signed a document known ever since as the Great Charter, in Latin *Magna Carta* or *Charta*.

Contents of the Great Charter.—It contained sixty three clauses binding the king to refrain from all manner of oppressions which had been committed contrary to the law and customs of England, and imposing like obligations on the clergy and feudal lords. The ancient liberties of the Church were confirmed, the king's right to levy 'aids' and dues from his feudal tenants, their widows, or orphans, was strictly limited, no taxes were to be levied without the consent of the Great Council, duly summoned for the purpose, 'to none,' says the king, 'will we sell, to none will we deny, to none will we

¹ John was not present in person at Bouvines. He was operating in Poitou. The idea was that the allies should join forces at Paris.

delay right or justice,' no freeman was to be punished 'except by the legal judgement of his peers [equals], or by the law of the land', 'the city of London shall have all its ancient liberties, and its free customs, as well by land as by water Besides, we will and grant, that all other cities and burghs and towns, and sea ports shall have all their liberties and free customs' The execution of all the promises recorded in the charter was to be secured by what may be called in modern commercial language a 'Committee of Inspection', consisting of twenty five persons, namely, twenty-four barons and the Mayor of London who were empowered by the king, if he should break his word, to 'distress and harass us by all the ways in which they can, that is to say, by the taking of our castles lands and possessions, and by other means in their power until the excess shall have been redressed, according to their verdict, saving our person, and the persons of our queen and children'

Importance of the Charter.—The Great Charter, of which the principal provisions have been thus briefly stated, has always been regarded as the foundation of English liberty, and in later reigns was frequently confirmed, with certain omissions and amendments Although often violated, it has always stood as the record of the least that Englishmen are entitled as of right to demand from their rulers

End of John's Reign—John, who had no intention of keeping his promises induced the Pope to give him leave to break them With the help of hired foreign troops he attacked the barons and pressed them so hard that they were driven to offer the crown to Louis son of the King of France Philip Augustus Louis landed with an army in the spring of 1216, but met with much opposition and John might have succeeded in beating down all resistance if he had lived Happily for the kingdom he died in October, leaving the crown to his son Henry, a child nine years of age

Character of John—The character of John may be summed up in the words of Professor Oman. 'No man had a good

word to say for him, cruel, perjured, rash and cowardly by turns, an evil liver, a treacherous son and brother, he was loathed by every one who knew him' A writer of his time expressed himself even more strongly in the phrase 'Foul as it is, hell itself is defiled by the fouler presence of John' But he was no fool for, as Professor York Powell observes 'John had all the vices most of the talent, and few of the virtues of his family

LEADING DATES

Accession of Henry II	1154
War of Toulouse	1159
Constitutions of Clarendon	1164
Acquisition of Brittany	1166
Murder of Thomas Becket	1170
Partial conquest of Ireland	1171 1172
Rebellion of the barons	1173 1174
Accession of Richard I	1189
Accession of John	1199
Murder of Arthur of Brittany	1203
Loss of Normandy &c.	1204
Quarrel with Pope Innocent III	1205-13
Battle of Bouvines	1214
The Great Charter	June 15 1215
Accession of Henry III	1216

CHAPTER VIII

HENRY III 1216-72

Accession of Henry III, the Regency —The eastern counties being in possession of the French invader the boy king Henry was crowned at Gloucester in the west On his behalf government was carried on by William the Marshal Earl of Pembroke and Gualo the legate or representative of the Pope whose influence had been used against Louis and in favour of young Henry In the following year (1217) Prince Louis finding that he could do nothing in England went back to France When the Earl of Pembroke died (1219) his place in the government was taken by Hubert de Burgh,

who practically ruled England for thirteen years, until 1232, when he was turned out of office by King Henry, who had come of age in 1227. During the rule of Hubert the Great Charter had been renewed, with certain omissions, and many barons had been compelled to surrender their castles.

Misgovernment; Papal Exactions.—Henry, a weak man, unstable in his purposes, and no soldier, was quite unfit to be king in such troublous times. Like Edward the Confessor, he showed undue favour to Frenchmen, to whom he gave lands and valuable offices rather than to Englishmen. After his marriage to Eleanor of Provence (1236) the court was crowded with her greedy relatives. The Pope, who had helped Henry to secure the throne and always found in him a willing tool, exacted great sums of money from the clergy, who were forced to pay under pressure from the king as well as from Rome. The exactions of the foreign favourites at court and of the Pope pressed so hardly on the kingdom that deep discontent was felt and expressed. Edmund Rich, Archbishop of Canterbury, an excellent and learned man, and Grossetête Bishop of Lincoln tried to stop the abuses, but could do no good. The king wasted the money which he gathered and failed utterly in an attempt to recover the province of Poitou in France, which King John had lost. Henry allowed himself to be dragged into expensive schemes of the Pope, which did not concern England at all. In 1254, while Henry was away in Gascony, where he did nothing of importance, the queen and his brother Richard the Regents, summoned a Great Council for the purpose of raising money, to which 'knights of the shire', or country gentlemen as distinct from barons, were summoned for the first time, four from each shire or county. This step marks an important stage in the formation of the House of Commons.

Famine; Revolt of the Barons—A dreadful famine occurred in 1277. In the following year, although the people were dying of hunger by thousands, Henry dared to ask that one-third of the whole revenue of the kingdom should be sent to

the Pope The barons could not endure such a monstrous demand A Great Council, to which the French name of Parliament now began to be applied, met at Oxford, and by decisions known as the 'Provisions of Oxford' compelled the king to submit to the control of a committee of barons and to expel foreigners In 1261 the king recovered power, having made peace with France, and given up all claims to the lost French provinces After some fighting with his barons, an attempt to settle the quarrel by the arbitration of the King of France failed, and open war between Henry and his subjects broke out, in 1264

Simon de Montfort ; Battle of Lewes, 1264—The leader of the revolt was Simon de Montfort, a great noble in France, and also Earl of Leicester in England, who was married to King Henry's sister The king with his army marched into Sussex for the purpose of occupying the 'Cinque Ports', the five harbours on the south-eastern coast commanding the English channel¹ At the town of Lewes Simon utterly defeated him taking as prisoners the king himself, his eldest son Prince Edward, then fifteen years of age and Richard, Earl of Cornwall, the king's brother

Parliament of 1265 ; Battle of Evesham.—Earl Simon was now the real ruler of the kingdom, and during the year of his authority did all he could to restore order and govern the country justly He had the hearty support of the clergy and townspeople generally, but only of some of the nobles The influence of France and the Pope was all on the king's side Simon summoned a new Parliament of his supporters (1265), which included not only 'knights of the shire', as in 1254, but also 'burgesses', or citizens, two 'discreet loyal, and honest men' from each of the principal towns, and so for the first time a Parliament was made up including all the classes

¹ Hastings Romney Dover, Sandwich and Hythe, which supplied the best part of the ships for defence of the country down to the time of Henry VII Only Dover is now important as a harbour 'Cinque' means 'five' in French.

which ever since have been considered essential The king as usual swore to give up his unlawful practices but never meant to keep his word Before long fresh disputes broke out between Earl Simon and other nobles while Prince Edward escaped and raised an army The Earl surprised at Evesham in Worcestershire in a position from which withdrawal was impossible was totally defeated and killed after a gallant resistance during which he fought stoutly like a giant for the liberties of England



AYDON CASTLE IN NORTHUMBERLAND THIRTEENTH CENTURY

Character of Simon de Montfort.—He was Bishop Creighton writes a man of rare ability of keen political foresight of lofty purpose and of resolute mind Foreigner though he was the English people loved and honoured him regarding him as a martyr in their cause and not as a rebel He was a devout man and after his death was treated as a saint many miracles being believed to happen at his tomb His fate was lamented in popular songs which express the general grief in words such as these

Now here low lies the flower of price who knew so much
of war

The Earl Montfort whose luckless sort [fate] the land shall
long deplore

Prince Edward's Crusade, Death of Henry III.—After the battle of Evesham (1265) the duties of government passed from the weak grasp of Henry into the strong hands of his son Edward, who used his victory with mercy and justice. The land had such peace that Prince Edward was able to leave England in 1270 to join King Louis IX of France in the seventh and last crusade. King Louis having died at Tunis, Edward went on to the Holy Land and captured Acre, but did not succeed in wresting Palestine from the Muslims. In November 1272 King Henry died at the age of sixty five, and Prince Edward, although then in Sicily on his way home, was proclaimed king without opposition and without formal election, or waiting for his coronation. He disposed of various business in Italy, France, and Flanders, and so did not reach England until August 1274. In that month he was crowned at Westminster, all preparations having been made and the peace well kept by Robert Burnell and other able counsellors who had acted as regents during his absence.

Development of Parliament.—In the history of the English constitution the troubled reign of Henry III is memorable because the 'knights of the shire', or country gentlemen, were first summoned to Parliament in 1254¹ and 'burgesses', or representatives of the towns, were first summoned in 1265, two important steps being thus taken in constituting the complete House of Commons. But the parliaments of Henry III were merely the Norman Great Council slightly modified, of which the chief function was to grant money. They were not used for the purpose of making regular laws. Parliament in the modern sense dates from the reign of Henry's son, Edward I, who adopted and carried further the policy of his old enemy Simon de Montfort.

Unity of English Nation —We have seen how from the days of Henry I the fusion or melting together of the Normans and

¹ In Simon de Montfort's Parliament of 1264 the knights of the shire were 'elected for this purpose [*scil.* to confer with the king] by assent of the county'.


English had begun, and how the process had continued in later reigns. The loss of the northern provinces of France in John's time forced Henry III and his nobles to be Englishmen rather than Frenchmen, and notwithstanding King Henry's personal liking for French favourites, the undivided English nation may be said to date from his reign. The English language, despised by the early Norman settlers, now began to be commonly used for books on history and other subjects.

University of Oxford.—The gatherings of thousands of students at Oxford for the purpose of hearing lectures on law and theology had begun to take more formal shape as an organized University, and the earliest of the Colleges, Merton, was founded at Oxford in 1274. 'Scholars usually began with the Arts course, studying first the 'threefold way', Grammar, Logic and Rhetoric, and then the 'fourfold way', Music, Arithmetic, Geometry, and Astronomy.'¹ After four years' study they could become Bachelors of Arts and after three years' more work, Masters of Arts. Theology and Law usually were the subjects studied by graduates.

Roger Bacon—The greatest and most original of the early Oxford scholars was Roger Bacon, who laboured for forty years teaching languages, mathematics, and optics, and working out the principles of scientific research. But, although later ages have recognized his worth, the men of his own time, caring for little else than law and theology neglected his teaching, and so, as he said himself in his old age, suffered him to remain 'unheard forgotten buried'.

Growth of Towns and Middle Class.—The Universities, with their crowds of students drawn from all parts and divided into Northern and Southern 'Nations', did much to bring the different sections of Englishmen together. The northerners and southerners had their quarrels, but at least they met and knew each other and studied under the same teachers. The unity of the English people was also furthered by the continued growth of London and other towns in the local affairs of

¹ Music was included chiefly for purposes of church services.



TOMB OF HENRY III, WESTMINSTER ABBEY

which English and Normans were equally interested. A rich middle class of citizens was thus gradually formed which knew no distinctions of race and daily increased in influence.

Monasteries—The introduction of the Franciscan and Dominican orders of monks with the consequent multiplication of monasteries (the *maths* or *sanghāramas* of India), was closely connected both with the spread of education at the Universities and with the growth of towns. Many, if not most, of the learned men were monks: the principal monasteries became centres of knowledge and art as the ancient Buddhist monasteries had been in India, and as those of Burma still are, while towns grew up in safety under the protection of the monastic brotherhoods. Church architecture during this period attained its highest beauty as attested by Salisbury Cathedral the rebuilding of Westminster Abbey and many other works.

The Long Bow—The long bow, borrowed from the South Welsh (*ante* p. 51), which in the next century enabled the English yeomen or small landholders, to rout the chivalry of France was first recognized as a national weapon by an ordinance called the 'Assize of Arms' (see *ante*, p. 68) published in 1252.

LEADING DATES

Accession of Henry III., William the Marshal	1216
Departure of King Louis of France	1217
Hubert de Burgh minister	1219-32
Marriage of the king	1236
Knights of the shire first summoned to Parliament	1254
Famine	1257
Revolt of barons, Provisions of Oxford	1258
Battle of Lewes	1264
Burgesses first summoned to Parliament	1265
Battle of Evesham	1265
Prince Edward goes on Seventh and last Crusade	1270
Death of Henry III.; proclamation of Edward I	Nov 1272

BOOK III

EDWARD I TO THE DEATH OF HENRY VII

CHAPTER IX

EDWARD I AND EDWARD II, 1272-1327

Personal Qualities of Edward I.—Edward, when crowned in August 1274, was thirty-five years of age,

In the midway of this our mortal life,
the time when a man's powers are at their best Handsome, long-limbed, and strong, he had all the bodily perfections needed for a king, while in mind and moral character he was equally well fitted for his high calling Born at Westminster, and christened in memory of the Confessor, he was not only the first king since the Norman Conquest to bear an English name, but was more of an Englishman than any of his predecessors¹

Prosperity for 16 Years, 1274-90.—The first sixteen years of his reign (1274-90) offer a record of unbroken success in government and war, coupled with domestic happiness such as rarely falls to the lot of kings. Edward's Spanish queen Eleanor of Castile, a thoroughly good woman, was his faithful and dearly loved wife for thirty-five years, and the year of her death (1290) was the beginning of his troubles.

Conquest of Wales.—During those happy sixteen years the king made himself master of Wales, which had long acknowledged more or less regularly its feudal dependence on England. The wild clans of the Welsh hills, which continually harried the border counties, were held in check imperfectly by a line of castles and the sharp swords of the 'Lords of the Marches', the feudal landholders on the frontier. At the beginning of

¹ When he is called Edward I, his Saxon namesakes are not reckoned.

Edward's reign the Prince of North Wales by name Llewelyn, son of Griffith had grown so proud that he treated with scorn repeated summonses to come and do homage to his lord. The king who showed much patience was at last obliged to assert his authority by arms and exact the homage demanded (1277). Five years later war began again but a few months of fighting settled the business. Llewelyn was killed in a skirmish his brother David who had first submitted and then rebelled was justly executed and the newly annexed country divided into six counties was brought under English law (with certain exceptions) by the Statute of Wales (1284). The king's son also named Edward born at Carnarvon was created Prince of Wales which title has been conferred invariably upon the eldest son of each later sovereign¹. The tradition of a massacre of the Welsh bards on which Gray founded his well known poem *The Bard* beginning

Ruin seize thee ruthless king

has no basis of fact. Edward at that period of his life far from being a ruthless king was as an old chronicler truly records slow to strife just and merciful. Certain small rebellions were suppressed a few years later. Wales has remained generally loyal to the English crown ever since while still cherishing her own national customs, traditions and language.

Laws—It is impossible in a little book like this to give an account at all full of the many laws made by Edward I which are the basis of the English common law. Only a few points can be noticed. The student who wishes to understand the high merit of Edward's work as a lawgiver must read one or other of the larger histories. 'With the reign of Edward Green observes begins modern England the England in which we live. His time was an age of lawyers. He had a thoroughly legal mind himself and was

The present Prince of Wales received formal investiture at Carnarvon on July 13 1911



[Photo by S Smith Lincoln]
EDWARD I AND ELEANOR

well served in preparing his laws by Robert Burnell, an Italian named Accursi, and many other capable men. The king, 'a clear sighted man of business' worked upon the foundations laid by Henry I and Henry II (*ante*, pp 59, 68). He brought nearly into their modern shape the Courts of King's Bench, Exchequer, and Common Pleas, now Divisions of the High Court. His statute of Winchester (1285) improved on the old 'Assizes of Arms' (*ante*, pp 68, 82). The Statute of Merchants (1283) provided for the recovery of trade debts. The Statute of Mortmain (1279) checked the excessive growth of the landed estates held by the 'deadhand' (*mortmain*) of the corporations of the church¹. The statute known by the Latin technical title *Quia Emptores* (1290) limited the feudal power of the nobles by increasing the number of tenants holding direct from the crown. Many other laws were passed which cannot be even named here. The development of Parliament belongs rather to the second period of the reign after 1290, and will be noticed in due course.

Expulsion of the Jews—The year 1290 was also marked by a measure not to be commended, the expulsion from England of all the Jews, some 16 000 in number. No Jew was allowed to live in the kingdom again until Cromwell's time in the seventeenth century. The king, who no doubt was a loser by driving out the Jew capitalists, seems to have acted under pressure from popular hatred of the Hebrew race.

The Maid of Norway—The second half of Edward's reign (1290–1307) was occupied by almost continuous wars with Scotland and France and consequent difficulties in raising money. King Alexander of Scotland died in 1286. His nearest surviving relation was a child, known as the Maid of Norway, daughter of his daughter and Eric King of Norway.

¹ The clergy were then celibate, and so had no natural heirs, but could hold property in perpetuity as corporations with official succession. The 'corporation' in law might be either a body of persons like the dean and chapter of a cathedral, or a single official person like the bishop of a diocese, or the rector of a parish.

The notables of Scotland accepted her as queen, and after taking the advice of King Edward, who was uncle of her mother, the late Queen of Norway, appointed a regency. In 1289 an agreement was made between Edward, the ambassadors of the King of Norway, and Scottish commissioners to betroth the Maid to the Prince of Wales, and so to unite the kingdoms of England and Scotland. Unhappily, this wise plan came to naught owing to the death of the Maid in 1290.

John de Balliol made King, 1292.—Thirteen candidates for the throne then appeared, and Edward was asked to decide between them as arbitrator or umpire. Since the days of Edward the Elder the English kings had from time to time claimed to be the feudal lords paramount of Scotland, but much doubt attached to the validity of their claim. King Edward, feeling bound to maintain it, refused to arbitrate unless it was accepted. Ultimately, the candidates accepted his condition, and a fairly constituted commission of 104 members under the presidency of the English king assembled at Norham to try the case. Three candidates only had claims deserving consideration, namely John de Balliol, Robert Bruce (de Brus), and John de Hastings, all descended from daughters of the brother of William the Lion, the king who had died in 1214. John de Hastings wished the kingdom to be divided into three parts. The commission ruled that the kingdom was one and indivisible, and that the case lay between Balliol and Bruce. Edward and the commission decided in favour of Balliol as being the descendant of the eldest daughter. He, accordingly, was crowned and did homage to Edward (1292). The whole transaction was carried out with solemnity and fairness, and the new king was put in possession of the fortresses and the entire kingdom. At the close of the same year Edward came home, the acknowledged Lord Paramount of Scotland.

First Conquest of Scotland, 1296.—In the following year (1293) a serious quarrel between French and English sailors

in the Channel brought on war with France Edward called on Scotland to aid him, but his action in accepting an appeal from one of the decisions of the King of Scotland, and summoning him to appear, gave such offence that the Scots revolted and dethroned de Baliol Early in 1296 they ravaged Cumberland with pitiless cruelty In April Edward stormed the frontier town of Berwick-on-Tweed, and followed up that success by a decisive victory at Dunbar In July de Baliol resigned the kingdom as being a fief forfeited for rebellion, and was sent to London whence he retired in peace to Normandy In August Edward took over the direct government of Scotland, and having appointed the necessary officers, returned home

Revolt of William Wallace ; Battle of Falkirk, 1298.—Next year (May 1297), Sir Wilham Wallace, a young outlawed knight raised an irregular force with which he attacked the English At the bridge of Stirling he inflicted a severe defeat on Edward's general, and then made a raid into England, committing the most devilish atrocities, such as burning a church full of men and women and a schoolhouse full of boys In the spring of 1298, Edward, who had been detained in Flanders, returned to England and led a great army to the north, which in July, at Falkirk, destroyed the army of Wallace and drove that chief into hiding Wallace thenceforward disappears from history, and is not heard of again until 1305 when he was caught and executed for his Cumberland raid and other acts of hostility His short career of fourteen months offers little reason for the honour paid to his memory by Scotch writers, which is inspired by the verses of Blind Harry written two centuries after the events, and quite untrustworthy At the battle of Falkirk the power of the long bow was proved, the fight being decided by the showers of English arrows Scotland, although beaten, continued to be disturbed, and the complete reduction of the country was delayed until 1303-4 In the campaign of those years Edward crushed all opposition, marching through the land to the far north, and receiving homage from all the

landowners. In the autumn of 1305 he arranged for the government of the kingdom, and issued a document called the 'Form of the Peace of Scotland'.

Revolt of Robert Bruce; Death of Edward.—In the spring of 1306 the peace was broken by the treacherous revolt of Robert Bruce, grandson of John de Baliol's rival, who foully murdered his cousin Comyn in a church and then raised a rebellion against King Edward. Bruce, having been easily defeated by the royal officers, was driven to hide in the woods as an outlaw. The king, although now old and feeble, marched north in person, and no doubt would have thoroughly quelled the revolt if he had not fallen ill and died near Carlisle in July 1307.

War with France.—The war with France had ended in 1303 with the restoration to Edward of the province of Gascony, which the French king had seized some years earlier, and with the betrothal of the French princess Isabella to the Prince of Wales. These transactions laid the foundation for the Hundred Years' War begun in the reign of Edward III.

Money Difficulties.—The urgent need for money had caused Edward many difficulties, forcing him to adopt irregular ways of raising revenue, and bringing him into conflict with both the barons and the clergy. When the Pope forbade the clergy to pay taxes without his leave, the king retorted by withdrawing the protection of the law from the clergy, and taught them that it was safer to obey their own sovereign than the Bishop of Rome.

The Model Parliament of 1295.—Edward's difficulties led to the further development of parliamentary government. The famous Great or Model Parliament of 1295 was summoned to provide funds for the French and Scotch wars and also to concert measures for the defence of the kingdom. The king's writ of summons began with remarkable words, no doubt his own:

'Inasmuch as a most righteous law, established by the prudent foresight of the emperors, approves and ordains that

what toucheth all should be looked to and agreed upon by all, so also it is very clear that common dangers should be met by proper measures agreed upon in common ' ¹

The assembly so summoned included bishops, abbots, earls, barons, two knights from each shire, two burgesses from each borough and representatives of the clergy of lower rank. We cannot be certain whether the members met as one House or not but probably they assembled in separate 'orders'. The distinct separation of the Houses of Lords and Commons came later in the reign of Edward III.

Checks on Royal Power of Taxation—The king's attempts to levy money in irregular ways were checked by the 'Confirmation of the Charters' (1297), further proceedings on similar lines in 1300, and by the Parliament of Lincoln (1301). That parliament also rejected in the plainest terms an impudent claim made by the Pope to dispose of the kingdom of Scotland, resolving that

'Neither do we, nor will we permit—as we neither can nor ought—our aforesaid lord the king to do, or attempt to do, even if he wished it, the things before mentioned, things so unwarranted by custom or obligation, so prejudicial, and otherwise so unheard of'

Such bold language must have startled the Pope and probably was not altogether pleasing to the king, who tried to soften it by sending His Holiness a more polite letter at the same time.

Character of Edward I—The grandeur of Edward's character and the wisdom of his policy were obscured for several generations by the popular writings in prose and poetry of Hume, Scott, and other eminent Scotch authors of the eighteenth century, who could see little good in the conqueror of Scotland, and eagerly accepted all tales to his discredit. Of late years he has come into his own again, and is justly declared by Bishop Creighton to be 'the greatest of English

¹ Professor York Powell's version. An earlier Parliament in 1275 was also called 'The Model'

kings' Except Alfred none can dispute that honour with him, but the fullness of our knowledge about Edward inclines the balance in his favour. An Elizabethan writer worthily describes him as a man 'in whom we see the value of wisdom, kingly powers, and noble industry—a fatherly king to his people, employing all his life, care, and labour to benefit and nourish the commonwealth—in whom the good government and commonwealth of England had their chief foundation'. Many similar testimonies might be quoted. Edward kept faith strictly, living up to his motto *Pactum serva*, 'keep troth,' as graven on his tomb at Westminster.

Edward II; Battle of Bannockburn, 1314—Edward II, who was proclaimed king without objection from anybody, was an unworthy son of his great father, a good for nothing, idle, pleasure seeking young man, guided by the favourites who provided his amusements. He began his evil reign by disobeying all his late father's commands for carrying on the war with Scotland, and having withdrawn his forces, allowed Bruce to establish himself as king. A belated attempt to recover Scotland resulted in the terrible defeat of the English at Bannockburn near Stirling (1314). Peace was made later, and Bruce was recognized as independent king in 1328. In 1329 he died of leprosy, and was succeeded by his son David¹.

Abdication and Murder of the King—Edward during the early part of his reign misgoverned England through Piers Gaveston, who was put to death by the barons in 1312. For a time, the 'Lords Ordainers', a committee of barons, took the government out of the king's hands. Later, in 1321, a new favourite, Hugh Despenser attained power, and the country continued in extreme misery from famine, pestilence, and over taxation. The Despensers obtained the passing of a statute at York in 1322 which revoked the Lords Ordainers' proceedings, and laid down the important principle that laws required to be passed 'by our lord the king and by the

¹ Leprosy, now unknown in England, was common there for many centuries. King Henry IV is said to have died of the disease in 1413.

consent of the prelates, earls, and barons, *and commonalty* of the realm, according as hath been hitherto accustomed'. The queen Isabella, who despised her worthless husband and was attached to Roger Mortimer, leader of the discontented barons ultimately destroyed the Despensers and forced the king to abdicate in favour of his son (January 1327). In September Edward was secretly murdered in Berkeley Castle.

LEADING DATES

Coronation of Edward I	August 12 th 4
Statute of Mortmain	12 th 9
Statute of Merchants	1283
Statute of Wales and completion of conquest	1284
Statute of Winchester	1285
Statute Quia Emptores expulsion of the Jews, death of Queen Eleanor and of the Maid of Norway	1290
John de Balliol (Balliol) crowned king of Scotland	1292
Model or Great Parliament	1295
Confirmation of the Charters	1297
First conquest of Scotland battle of Dunbar	1298
Revolt of William Wallace battle of Falkirk	1297, 1298
Parliament of Lincoln	1301
Complete conquest of Scotland	1303-5
Revolt of Robert Bruce	1306
Death of Edward I	July 1307
Accession of Edward II	July 1307
Battle of Bannockburn	1314
Deposition of Edward II	Jan 1327
Murder of Edward II	Sept. 1327

CHAPTER X

EDWARD III AND RICHARD II 1327-99

6. **Misrule of Mortimer.**—The suffering kingdom gained nothing immediately by the deposition of Edward II and the overthrow of the Despensers, the Queen Mother and her paramour, Mortimer, continuing the former misgovernment. Their rule was marked by the Treaty of Northampton

(1328), known as the 'Shameful Peace', which gave up the English claim on Scotland and recognized Robert Bruce as its independent king. When he died in the following year, David, his infant son and successor, was married to the Princess Joan, also a child, sister of Edward III.

Edward III assumes power.—In 1330, Edward, now almost eighteen years of age, resolved to rule in person. He suddenly seized Mortimer, who was executed with the approval of Parliament, and confined his mother for the rest of her life at Castle Rising in Norfolk.

Wars with Scotland.—The young king tried to regain Scotland by setting up Edward, son of John de Baliol, as king and had him crowned. But the English nominee was never heartily accepted by the people of Scotland and in spite of a severe defeat of David's party at Halidon Hill near Berwick (1333) by the irresistible English archers was unable to maintain himself as king. In 1346, the year of Crecy, the English gained another great victory at Neville's Cross near Durham, when King David was taken prisoner, but, even after that, Edward de Baliol was not strong enough to secure his seat on the throne. Ten years later he gave up the attempt and withdrew.

Beginning of the Hundred Years' War, 1337.—The Scotch war, thus briefly outlined, and the long-continued attempt to conquer France were the chief occupations of Edward's reign. The king, consumed by a passion for fighting and adventure, was careless of the cost in blood, misery, and treasure which his reckless ambition involved. The French wars begun in 1337, lasted with certain brief interruptions until 1453, and are often loosely called as a whole the 'Hundred Years' War'. The beginning of the struggle was due to the support given to the Scots by the French king who was intensely anxious to get the English out of Aquitaine, and was glad to employ some of their strength on the Scotch border. The early campaigns were not of much importance, except for a brilliant naval victory won by the English ships off

Slays (1340) on the Flemish coast The English king sought to protect his province of Gascony against French attack and to protect the valuable trade with Flanders He assumed the title of King of France in right of his mother

Battle of Crécy, 1346; capture of Calais, 1347—In 1346 Edward swept through Normandy with a large army, without meeting serious opposition, and advanced almost up to the gates of Paris When obliged to retreat he narrowly escaped destruction at the hands of the far more numerous French host, but his small army halting at Crécy (Cressy), in northern France between Amiens and Calais, gained a wonderful victory over the French, mainly due, as at Neville's Cross, to the shooting of his archers The important port of Calais was forced after a long siege to surrender in the following year, and remained an English possession for two centuries, much valued by the English people as strengthening their command over the Channel and securing an ever open gate into France

The Black Death 1348-9.—The splendid victories of Neville's Cross and Crécy, and the capture of Calais naturally filled the English nation with pride, which found expression in feasting and jollity paid for by the ransom of prisoners and the plunder taken from the French and Scots But the joy was soon turned into sorrow In 1348 a deadly form of plague, which had travelled from China, through the Crimea, and Egypt along the Mediterranean Sea, and then across Europe, seized England and in the course of about a year destroyed some two millions more or less of the people, amounting probably to half of the population In Norwich alone nearly 60 000 are said to have died The disease was of the fatal pneumonic kind, attacking the lungs, like the pestilence which afflicted Manchuria in 1911 France suffered as severely as England, and Ireland did not escape


Battle of Poitiers, 1356.—After the capture of Calais both parties to the war were exhausted, and a truce was observed until 1355 when fighting began again King Edward's eldest

son, the Black Prince, marched through Southern France, a rich country, whose 'people, good and simple, did not know what war was', and returned to Bordeaux laden with plunder. In the next year he rashly moved into Central France with a small army, plundering as usual. At Poitiers he met the French host at least five or six times as numerous as his own, and ought to have been destroyed. But again the English archers proved to be irresistible, the French were defeated with immense slaughter, and their king was taken prisoner.

Treaty of Bretigny, 1360.—Another truce followed. At last France, worn out by a cruel war, was forced to accept the Treaty of Bretigny, which ceded to England in full sovereignty the whole Duchy of Aquitaine including Poitou besides Calais with the adjoining territory, and the small county of Ponthieu in which Creçy is situated. Edward on his part gave up his ill founded claim to the crown of France.

English losses; Death of the Black Prince—The signing of the treaty did not free France from the miseries of war. The 'Free Companies', or armies of hired soldiers, who had fought for one or other king just as the Indian Pindaris a hundred years ago were attached to either Holkar or Sindia spread over the country, pillaging and murdering. The Black Prince who, as Duke of Aquitaine, was his father's viceroy in France, foolishly undertook to support Peter the Cruel, the villainous claimant to the throne of Castile in Spain (1367). His policy proved to be wholly unsuccessful. Even the navy was neglected, and in 1372 English ships were shamefully defeated by the French and Spaniards off Rochelle. The war with France was renewed, and the results of much fighting by land and sea were that Peter was killed by his brother and the English territory in France was reduced to little more than Calais with its surrounding district in the north, and the towns of Bayonne and Bordeaux in the south. The Black Prince fell ill and was obliged to return to England, where he died in 1376.

Failure and Death of Edward III—Thus forty years of



THE BLACK PRINCE
From an effigy on his Tomb in Canterbury Cathedral

conflict (1337-77) had ended in the failure of the English attempt to conquer France, and when Edward died his French dominions were far less extensive than when he came to the throne. The king in his latter years became unfit for business, and fell under the evil influence of a heartless mistress named Alice Perrers. The misrule that followed caused deep discontent, and in June 1377, when Edward passed away, he would have died alone and uncared for, if a single priest had not come in and watched by his bed.

Wickedness and waste of his policy.—Both Edward and his son, the Black Prince, were gallant knights, the bravest of the brave, and full of courtesy to other knights. But neither was a good ruler, nor even an able general. Though they could fight with the best, they could not plan a campaign, and the brilliancy of the victories of Crecy and Poitiers does not affect the criticism that competent generals would never have allowed their armies to come into positions where fights so desperate were unavoidable. The whole French policy of Edward may be fairly described as one of wickedness and waste, designed to gratify personal ambition and love of fighting for its own sake, without a moment's thought for the unutterable misery inflicted on France or the heavy burdens imposed on England by the king's unceasing demands for men, money, and ships. The policy had not even the merit of success. The only substantial advantage gained, the occupation of Calais, was more than balanced by the loss of nearly all Aquitaine.

Parliaments—Edward's incessant need for supplies compelled him to summon many parliaments, and when he wanted money he was always ready to 'confirm the charters'. But he had none of the statesmanlike ability of his grandfather, Edward I, and in his heart was a feudal despot, with little care for the real welfare of his kingdom. The king rightly refused to pay the Pope the tribute to which John had agreed when he consented to hold England as the Pope's vassal (*ante*, p. 73); and some check was imposed on papal greed by the statutes called 'Provisors' and *Praemunire*, which attempted to

prevent the Pope from appointing bishops or other church dignitaries in England, and forbade Englishmen to prefer appeals out of the realm to the Pope. But little real progress was made in asserting effectually the power of parliament as against either the greed of the church or the despotism of the king, and the charters so often confirmed were as often violated. The 'Good Parliament' of 1376 made a serious attempt at reform but all that it had done was reversed in the next year by a new parliament under the influence of John of Gaunt Duke of Lancaster, the king's third son, which raised money by a new device a poll tax of fourpence a head on every person in the kingdom, beggars only excepted. This new form of taxation was especially designed to hit the working classes whose wages were rising.

Statute of Labourers—The pestilence of 1348-9, which reappeared in 1361-2 and 1369 having caused a great scarcity of labour, the labourers who under the feudal system were usually serfs or villeins attached to each manor and bound to render personal services to its lord, naturally tried to better themselves by demanding higher wages and more liberty. The upper classes insisting that the workers must be content with the old rates of wages as they stood before the Black Death tried to enforce their wishes by the Statute of Labourers (1351). But the facts were too strong for the law, which was constantly evaded. Much plough land was turned into pasture as requiring few men to work it, and gradually, very slowly, the serfs became either free tenants or free labourers. In the next reign as we shall see presently, the common people revolted against the harsh and stupid policy expressed in the Statute of Labourers. Similar troubles had occurred in France a generation earlier.

Abuses in the Church—The abuses in the Church were plainly to be seen of all men. Bishops and abbots, who should have led holy lives devoted to religion, often behaved exactly in the same way as lay feudal lords—fighting oppressing and living in open profligacy. Revenues which should have been

spent on works of piety and charity were misused, and the monks and friars of the monasteries, as has often happened to Indian *maths*, forgot their vows when they grew rich. The Church, one way or another, is said to have been in possession of one-third of the land in the kingdom. John Wycliffe, an Oxford priest, did good service in writing and preaching against the evil ways of the clergy, and is reckoned the first of the 'Reformers'.


The English Language.—Up to the middle of the fourteenth century the nobles and upper classes generally spoke French, despising English as vulgar. King Edward III himself knew hardly any English. But the native tongue was gradually overcoming the foreign, and in 1362 Parliament was opened with an English speech, and orders were issued that pleadings in the law-courts should be in English. The language, in a form differing widely from that of Alfred and the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, was employed with great effect in William Langland's poem, the *Vision of Piers Plowman* (1362-8), and a little later in the immortal works of Geoffrey Chaucer, who was in the service of the Duke of Lancaster. The *Vision of Piers Plowman* voices in rude verse the complaint of the poor, depicting their sufferings with grim realism. The courtly Chaucer deals with 'a world of wealth and ease and laughter', which takes little notice of the misery in the background.

Trade and Architecture.—In spite of pestilence, burnings, and plunderings on land, piracy at sea, and almost incessant war, trade distinctly increased. Queen Philippa induced many Flemish weavers to settle in the island, and so taught the English to weave their wool and not to be content with merely exporting it in a raw state, as they had been in the habit of doing. The English wool was the best in Europe. The English export trade in those days passed through certain towns called 'staples', in each of which the 'merchants of the staple' had a monopoly. The principal goods exported were fleeces, wool, leather, tin, and lead. The queen also

opened the first coal mine that had been worked since the time of the Romans. The king introduced a handsome gold coinage, the device of his 'nobles' being intended as a memorial of the naval victory at Sluys (*ante*, p. 94). The rich dress and other luxuries of the upper classes could have been supplied only by extensive foreign trade. Many Italian bankers and merchants were settled in London. The architecture of the period was magnificent and richly decorated. The Round Tower of Windsor Castle was built by Edward III, and many noble churches and other edifices of his age still remain.

Accession of Richard II; Regency.—Richard, son of the Black Prince, a boy ten or eleven years of age, who had been named by his grandfather as his successor, was quietly accepted as king and the government was conducted by his uncles, chiefly by John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster. The French war still dragged on with ill success, but the English people, remembering the glories of Crecy and Poitiers, were unwilling to confess that they could not conquer France. The enormous expense obliged the government in 1379 to renew the poll tax of 1377 in another form, and again in 1380 at treble the original rate. *In its latest form the tax pressed most heavily on the poorest of the people, and justly caused widespread discontent.*

The Great Revolt of 1381.—The working classes in both town and country suffered from many real grievances and much grinding oppression, which almost compelled them to follow the example set by the French peasantry a generation earlier and to try by force to better their miserable state. The trouble began in Essex, followed by Kent, and the revolt quickly spread over the south eastern and eastern counties. Some rioting also occurred later in Yorkshire and other parts, but it is not true as is asserted in some histories that there was a general concerted rising throughout the kingdom. Nor is it the fact that the poor people were much moved to action by the preaching of Wycliffe and other religious reformers. Their object was to win freedom from oppression and relief from



17 6 0 3 11124000

INN Round LO L t A W I DSON

grievous taxes. The men of Kent and Essex gained possession of London (June 1381), where they wrought much damage, and killed among others Archbishop Sudbury, the Chancellor. They showed great hostility to the foreign settlers, and especially to Queen Philippa's Flemings (*ante*, p. 99). The young king, then about fifteen years of age, showed splendid courage riding out to meet the rioters and persuading them to disperse by his personal influence and the grant of charters. Wat Tyler, the principal leader of the rebels, was slain in the king's presence. The ministers and nobles, who at first had failed to meet the danger boldly, soon mastered the revolt, and crushed it within a month. Executions followed, but, considering the habits of the times, were not very numerous. The government preferred to make money by levying heavy fines.

Failure of the Revolt.—The charters granted by the king were revoked by his ministers, and the attempt of the common people to free themselves from bondage failed. But the upper classes found it impossible to keep the lower in their old position as serfs, and a better system slowly came into use in both town and country. Although as late as the time of Queen Elizabeth (1574) a few peasants still continued to be 'villeins' or serfs, bound to the soil and subject to the orders of the lord of the manor, most of the 'villeins' had been freed long before her time, and had become either tenants paying rent or free labourers. In the towns, too, the tyranny of the rich was mitigated by degrees, and the poorer citizens won some share in the management of local affairs.

Richard's Personal Rule.—The young king found his chief difficulties in his own family. His uncles constantly intrigued for power against him and with each other, and in 1388 one of them, the Duke of Gloucester, obtained control over a 'parliament, called 'Admirable' by one party and 'Merciless' by another, which destroyed the king's friends. In June 1389, the king, then about twenty-two years of age,¹ suddenly

¹ Authorities differ as to the date of his birth, some giving January 6, 1367, others January 13, 1367, and others February 1366.

announced to his council that he was old enough to govern by himself. No direct opposition having been offered, he ruled the kingdom well for seven or eight years in his own way. Richard was anxious to make peace with France, and married as his second wife Isabella, the child daughter of the French king. That peace policy disliked by his nobles, seems to have been the chief cause of his undoing. From 1397 his conduct became more arbitrary, and caused discontent. In 1399 the king went to Ireland to try and arrange the affairs of that troubled kingdom. During his absence, his cousin Henry Duke of Hereford, the late Duke of Lancaster's son who had been banished with the Duke of Norfolk in the previous year, landed in England, and being either supported or not resisted by the other nobles forced Richard to abdicate. Henry had a personal grievance because his father's estates had been seized by the king. The duke then claimed the crown as a descendant of Henry III, and was proclaimed as Henry IV.¹ Richard was made away with secretly. His fate is to some extent uncertain but undoubtedly he was put to death and, according to the best evidence available he was cruelly killed by starvation at Pontefract (Pomfret) Castle, in Yorkshire.

Richard's Character and Death —The history of Richard II, like that of Richard III, has been so largely falsified by authors, including Shakespeare, writing in the Lancastrian interest, that it is hard to get at the truth. We may however, safely affirm that Richard did not deserve his hard fate. His government during the greater part of his years of personal rule was for the benefit of the kingdom, and he was quite right in trying to stop the wasting and hopeless war with France. He succeeded in effecting a long truce. His person was singularly handsome, with a certain feminine delicacy, and he

¹ He was descended from Edmund younger brother of Edward I. His right was inferior to that of Edmund Mortimer Earl of March great grandson of Lionel brother of the Black Prince. Henry IV was born at Bolingbroke, and is called Bolingbroke in some histories.

was a liberal patron of literature. The notion of some historians that he was insane seems to be wholly mistaken. His conduct in the Great Revolt of 1381, and again in 1399, when he dismissed the regency, shows that he was a man of high courage and if he had got fair play he might have done great things. He was only thirty three when he was destroyed. The obscure history of his reign is a subject too difficult for detailed treatment on a small scale. The best account of it is that by a French author M. Wallon who has done much to defend Richard's good name against his English traducers.

LEADING DATES

Accession of Edward III	1327
Peace of Northampton independence of Scotland	1328
King assumes power execution of Mortimer	1330
Beginning of Hundred Years War	1337
Battles of Neville's Cross and Crécy	1346
Capture of Calais	1347
Black Death (reappeared 1361-2 1369) first visitation	1348-9
Statute of Labourers	1351
Battle of Poitiers	1356
Treaty of Bretigny	1360
Death of Edward III	June 1377
Accession of Richard II	1377
Great Revolt (Wat Tyler's rebellion)	1381
King's personal rule on constitutional lines	1389-96
His despotic rule	1397-9
Deposition	Oct. 1399
Death	1400

CHAPTER XI

HOUSE OF LANCASTER HENRY IV HENRY V AND HENRY VI,
TO THE BEGINNING OF THE WARS OF THE ROSES 1399-1455

Accession of Henry IV, Opposition.—The new king was crowned with unusual splendour but all through his short reign was made to feel the truth of the saying that uneasy



RICHARD II
From the picture in Westminster Abbey

lies the head that wears a crown', especially when the crown has been won by violence and with the support of no more than a faction. While Henry could rely on London and the south, the northern counties, Scotland, Wales, and France, all were his enemies. An attempt by the Earl of Huntingdon and others early in 1400 to restore Richard led to the death of the unhappy prisoner. Nevertheless, many people believed



ENGLISH ARCHER, FIFTEENTH CENTURY CROSS BOW MAN
(*Cotton MS Julius, E. 17*)

him to be still alive, and a pretender was long maintained at the Scottish court.

Scotch and Welsh Wars and Rebellions.—A Scotch invasion was repelled at the battle of Homildon Hill in Northumberland (1402)—again by the power of the long bow. A dispute about the ransom of prisoners then taken made the Earl of Northumberland (Percy) rebel. He was defeated at Shrewsbury (1403), and his son, known as Harry Hotspur, was killed. Lord Mowbray and Archbishop Scrope of York likewise

revolted (1405), and being defeated, both were executed without form of law. In 1408 the Earl of Northumberland made another insurrection, failed again, and was slain. Wales rose under Owen Glendower at the beginning of the reign and remained practically independent for some years, but in 1409 the king recovered South Wales.

The King and Parliament.—The difficulties of his position, and the knowledge that his doubtful title to the crown rested on the assent of Parliament, made Henry dependent beyond other kings on that assembly, the goodwill of which was needed in order to obtain funds. In 1407 the House of Commons asserted its right to grant supplies of money independently of the Lords. The king suffered from epilepsy and leprosy, and from 1409 was mostly confined to bed, so that the government was carried on by his son Henry the Prince of Wales and the Beauforts, sons of John of Gaunt.

Persecution of the Lollards—Both the king and the prince unfortunately agreed with Archbishop Arundel that differences of opinion on religious matters ought to be repressed by force and accordingly a statute was passed (1401) authorizing the burning alive of heretics that is to say of persons who would not accept all the doctrines taught officially by the Pope and bishops. This shocking law the first persecuting Act in England decreed that every one found guilty of heresy in the bishops' court and persisting therein, should be given over to the sheriff to be burnt on a high place before the people, and that search should be made for all books of heresy that they might be burnt. The law was acted on during the reigns of both Henry IV and his son. Such persecution of opinion continued to be the disgrace of Europe for the next three centuries. In India similar action although not wholly unknown has been rare, and as a rule opinion, has been free and liberty of worship has been seldom denied.

Accession of Henry V—In March 1413, Henry IV died, and was succeeded without disturbance by his son Henry V, then twenty five years of age. The young king felt so

confident in his possession of the throne that he released his cousin Edmund Mortimer, Earl of March (*ante*, p. 103), who had been kept in confinement all through the reign of Henry IV.¹ Henry V was sincerely religious in his bigoted way, and felt it his duty to continue the persecution and burnings of the heretics nicknamed Lollards, who ventured to differ from the official creed. He did not hesitate even to execute with torture their leader Sir John Oldcastle, known, in right of his wife as Lord Cobham, who had been a personal friend of his own.

French War, Battle of Agincourt, 1415 — During the reign of Henry IV the French King Charles VI was insane, and his kingdom was torn by civil war. Irregular hostilities between the English and French had continued without any formal war. This state of things gave an opportunity to Henry V, a warrior from boyhood eager to win glory by renewing the war with France of again pressing the claim to the French crown made by Edward III. He was determined, as Shakespeare says in his noble play, to be

No king of England if not king of France,


and was resolved to risk everything in the adventure, which was made easier by the misfortunes of France. The royal policy was so popular in England that money for the execution of it was freely voted. Attempts made by the French government to offer terms were rejected with scorn and the war a purely aggressive one on Henry's part, was begun by the siege and capture of Harfleur a post at the mouth of the Seine river (1415). Henry whose force was not nearly large enough for its work was caught soon afterwards in a position very similar to that of Edward III at Crécy (*ante* p. 94), while trying like him to retreat on Calais. At Agincourt, the little English army, of about 9,000 or 10,000 men at most, 'a weak and sickly guard' as Shakespeare calls it and more

¹ Edmund never asserted his rights. He became Lieutenant of Ireland, where he died of the plague in 1424.



HENRY V
From the picture in the National Portrait Gallery

Henry, a splendid soldier and sportsman, and a just ruler, although terrible in his wrath and a bigot in religion, was in his lifetime the most popular of the English kings, and after his death was venerated by the next generation as a saint.



SHIP OF FIFTEENTH CENTURY

(Life of Pichard, Earl of Warwick, *Cotton MS Julius, E 1v*)

All England was ready to join in the prayer of old Sir Thomas Erpingham —

The Lord in heaven bless thee, noble Harry !

Accession of Henry VI ; Regency.—The glorious victories of Henry V silenced all questions as to the title of his family.

His infant son, a baby less than a year old,

Henry the Sixth, in infant bands crowned King
Of France and England did this king succeed,

and was accepted without a murmur, the government of France being committed to John, Duke of Bedford, the elder surviving brother of the late king, and that of England to Humphrey Duke of Gloucester, his younger brother, as Protector assisted by a Privy Council of fifteen nobles and bishops

The Duke of Bedford, Regent of France.—Charles VI, the imbecile king of France, died in the same year as his conqueror. His son, the Dauphin, took the title of Charles VII, and exercised more or less authority to the south of the Loire while the Duke of Bedford ruled Northern France as Regent on behalf of his infant nephew the English king, and did his duty well. He inflicted a heavy defeat on the French and their Scotch allies at Verneuil in 1424. The one strong place, the city of Orleans, which held out was besieged by Bedford. He was on the point of succeeding, when he was driven off and the whole course of the war changed by an event which may be fairly described as a miracle and has been a puzzle to all historians throughout the ages

The Maid of Orleans.—Joan or Jeanne Darc¹ a peasant girl of seventeen living in a province of France far from the seat of war, saw visions which called on her to save her country. With much difficulty she obtained audience of the king and was allowed to raise a force of 6 000 men. Clad in white armour like a man she rode to Orleans, made her way with her troops into the city, and inspired the garrison with such courage that in fifteen days the English were forced to raise the siege. The French then began to win victory after victory, and in 1429 Charles VII was crowned at Rheims. Joan now known as the Maid of Orleans, was regarded by the English as a witch. In 1431 she fell into their hands and

¹ 'Darc,' not 'D'Arc' or 'Joan of Arc', as commonly and wrongly written. Her real name was Jeanneton Darc.

was cruelly burnt alive at Rouen, dying like a saint, as indeed she was

Loss of the French Provinces.—From that time onwards, with some slight interruption, the English cause in France steadily lost ground. The able Duke of Bedford died in 1435, the Duke of Burgundy joined the French, and in 1445 the English government made a truce and married King Henry to Margaret of Anjou, a cousin of the French king. War was renewed later, but always without success to the English, and by 1453 the whole of the English territory in France had been lost, except Calais. Thus ended the Hundred Years' War.

Factions of the Nobles in England.—The king, always feeble in health, never much more than half witted, and sometimes out of his mind altogether, was obliged to lean upon one or other of the great nobles, his relatives in different degrees, who struggled with one another for the control of his person and so of the kingdom, which was grievously misgoverned. As Shakespeare puts it —

They lost France and made his England bleed

Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, the king's uncle, a foolish, headstrong man, was in favour of continuing the hopeless French war. Cardinal Beaufort advised peace, and in 1445 succeeded in arranging the marriage of Henry to Margaret of Anjou. In 1447, the Duke of Gloucester and the cardinal having both died, the Earl, afterwards Duke, of Suffolk obtained power. Richard, Duke of York, cousin of the king and next in succession to the throne, was sent away to Ireland as lieutenant of that country.

In 1450 the public discontent caused the impeachment, or prosecution by parliament, of Suffolk, who was murdered. Power now passed into the hands of the Duke of Somerset, who became extremely unpopular owing to the ill success of the French war and the failure of the government to keep order at home.

Rebellion of Jack Cade.—An insurrection broke out in Kent (1450), led by a low fellow named Jack Cade, who, like Wat Tyler, was admitted into London, where he committed murders and robberies, and, like his predecessor, was quickly defeated and killed. He is believed to have been an agent of the Yorkist party, rather than a genuine popular leader.

Beginning of the Wars of the Roses, 1455.—In the same year (1450) the Duke of York returned from Ireland, and prepared to oppose the government of Somerset by force, but the peace was not actually broken. In 1453 the queen bore to the king a son named Edward, who became the heir to the throne, excluding Richard, Duke of York, who was removed from the Privy Council by the queen. Next year the king went mad and the duke was made Protector, but when the king recovered for a time Somerset returned to power, and York determined to fight him and the queen. So far York had made no open claim to the crown—he was professedly fighting to overthrow Somerset's government and to protect himself against the queen, who championed her infant son. The armies met in the streets of St. Albans, where Somerset was defeated and slain. This fight is known as the first battle of St. Albans (1455). From this date the Wars of the Roses are held to have begun, so named because a white rose was the badge of the adherents of the Duke of York—the Yorkists, and a red rose was the badge of the adherents of the queen and her ministers—the Lancastrians. The king himself did not count, but each faction was eager to secure his person and use his name.

LEADING DATES

Accession of Henry IV	1399
Death of Richard II., revolt of Wales	1400
Statute for burning heretics	1402
Several rebellions—wars with Wales and Scotland	1402-9
Prince Henry in power	1409
Accession of Henry V.	1413
Battle of Agincourt	1415
Treaty of Troyes	1420

Accession of Henry VI	1422
Battle of Verneuil	1424
Siege of Orleans, Joan Darc	1429
Insurrection of Jack Cade	1430
Loss of French provinces except Calais	1433
First battle of St. Albans, beginning of the Wars of the Roses	1455

•

CHAPTER XII

THE WARS OF THE ROSES AND HOUSE OF YORK, TO THE
BATTLE OF BOSWORTH, 1455-85

The War to the Coronation of Edward IV, 1461.—We need not linger long over the repulsive history of the thirty years between the first battle of St Albans and the battle of Bosworth, a period filled with battles, murders, and shameless treacheries. The chief support of the Yorkist party was the able and intriguing Earl of Warwick, most of the nobles being inclined to side with the queen's party, the Lancastrians¹. The queen, a bloodthirsty, revengeful woman, was determined to do all possible to preserve the heritage of the throne of England for her boy Edward. Richard, Duke of York, after winning a battle at Northampton (1460), formally claimed the throne, and the lords decided to leave it to Henry for his life, while recognizing Richard as the heir, to the exclusion of Prince Edward of Lancaster. Queen Margaret, however, would hear of no compromise. At the close of the same year Duke Richard was killed at Wakefield, passing on his claim to the care of his son, Edward of York. In 1461 the Yorkists won the fight of Mortimer's Cross, and lost the second battle of St Albans. If the queen had been able, *then to secure London she might have gained her cause, but Edward of York was too quick for her, seized the capital,*

¹ This Earl of Warwick was Richard Neville. The title was borne afterwards by several distinct families.


and had himself proclaimed King (1461), in virtue of being heir to his father, Duke Richard, and also 'by authority of Parliament and forfeiture committed by King Henry'. Shortly afterwards he won a bloody battle at Towton in Yorkshire—the most important engagement of the war. It is said that from 28,000 to 30,000 of the Lancastrians were left dead on the field. The queen and King Henry were forced to take refuge in Scotland, and Edward of York was crowned as King Edward IV (June 29, 1461).

Restoration of Henry VI (1470); Battle of Barnet (1471).—Queen Margaret, however, still refused to despair of her son's cause, and was not turned from her purpose by learning that her feeble husband had been captured in 1465 and confined in the Tower of London. King Edward caused deep offence to Warwick and other nobles by avowing a secret marriage with a lady named Elizabeth Woodville, and giving power to members of her family. In 1470 Warwick openly changed sides, and with the help of France and the treacherous support of George, Duke of Clarence, the 'false, fleeting, perjured' brother of King Edward IV, succeeded in restoring King Henry VI to the throne for six months, driving King Edward out of the country. Next year (1471) King Edward returned, with aid from Burgundy, and defeated and killed Warwick, the 'king-maker', at the battle of Barnet a few miles to the north-west of London. King Henry was captured by the victors and again sent to the Tower, where he was secretly put to death not long afterwards.

Henry, Earl of Richmond.—King Edward was now secure on the throne gained by so much bloodshed. Not a single descendant of Henry IV was left alive, and the great Beaufort family, descended from John of Gaunt, was represented by a boy in exile, Henry, Earl of Richmond, whose mother, Margaret Beaufort, was great granddaughter of John of Gaunt and his third wife, Katharine Swynford. Henry of Richmond's grandfather, Owen Tudor, a Welsh gentleman, was further connected with the Lancastrian royal family by his marriage to the French princess, Katharine, widow of King Henry V.¹

Edward IV a Despot.—Edward IV, an idle, pleasure loving, though able man, was reputed a just, if indolent ruler. He made a futile invasion of France, and was bought off by Louis XI, the crafty French king. In 1478 King Edward executed his own brother, the Duke of Clarence, and was not ashamed to appear before parliament in person, making railing accusations against the prisoner. The popular legend, endorsed by Shakespeare, that Clarence was murdered by his other brother, the Duke of Gloucester, afterwards Richard III, has no basis of fact. King Edward alone is responsible for the duke's death. He governed as a despot, being freed from all rivalry by reason of the destruction of the princes and baronage, and independent of Parliament by reason of the enormous confiscations of the estates of the defeated

DESCENT OF HENRY VII.



lords. It is said that nearly a fifth of the land had passed into the royal possession at one period or another of the civil war. Edward also made large profit by trading on a vast scale in tin, wool, and cloth. When he wanted more money he managed to get it from the merchants and other wealthy people by demanding what he called 'benevolences', gifts more or less voluntary. His reign described by Green as the beginning of the 'New Monarchy', laid the foundation for the unchecked despotism of Henry VIII.

Usurpation of Richard III.—Edward IV died in April 1483 leaving two sons under the guardianship of their uncle Richard Duke of Gloucester. The elder a boy of twelve, was proclaimed king as Edward V but was never crowned. Richard's first business was to break the power of the queen mother's family which he did by ruthless executions. Very soon he found pretexts for declaring his own right to the crown to be superior to that of his nephews and on July 6 induced Parliament to allow him to be crowned as Richard III. No immediate opposition was offered. After a little time the Duke of Buckingham himself a descendant of Edward III, attempted a rebellion which failed and cost him his head.¹

Murder of the Young Princes.—The young princes who had been removed to the Tower were never seen again. Probably they were murdered secretly at some time in 1483 by Richard's orders. For many years a widespread belief prevailed that the younger boy the Duke of York had escaped and the evidence of his death is not absolutely conclusive. The real facts can never be known. No reliance can be placed upon the detailed accounts of the murder circulated long afterwards by Henry VII and repeated by Shakespeare and most historians. The balance of probability, however is in favour of the common opinion that both boys were put to death in some way or other by order of Richard. People although well accustomed to the slaughter of adult

The duke was grandson of Edmund Beaufort a grandson of John Gaunt and Katherine Swynford junior to the ancestor of Henry VII.



RICHARD III

From the picture in the National Portrait Gallery

princes by their relatives, were shocked at the murder of children, and wherever the reality of the crime was credited resentment was felt against the author of it

Battle of Bosworth ; Death and Character of Richard III.—Richard who is admitted even by Bacon, a hostile historian to have been ‘a prince in military virtue approved, jealous of the honour of the English nation and likewise a good law maker for the ease and solace of the common people’, gave promise, notwithstanding his crimes real or supposed, of proving an excellent king The ‘benevolences’ extorted by Edward IV were declared illegal, and useful measures for the *benefit of trade* were passed *during his short reign*

Crimes have been imputed to him which he did not commit It is certain that he did not either stab Prince Edward of Lancaster at Tewkesbury or murder the Duke of Clarence as related by Shakespeare, and strong reasons exist for acquitting him of the murder of Henry VI Undoubtedly he betrayed his trust as the guardian of his nephews in seizing the throne for himself That action was one readily condoned by the opinion of the fifteenth century, but in killing the boys as it is almost certain that he did he went further than even the lax principles of his time could approve His real history has been so carefully falsified by authors, Shakespeare included, writing in the Tudor interest, that the real facts cannot be fully ascertained He was beloved in the north of England, where he was best known Bacon records that in Yorkshire and Durham the memory of King Richard was so strong that it lay like lees in the bottom of men’s hearts, and if the vessel was but stirred, it would come up Whatever promise of capacity he showed was blighted by his early death, in the thirty third year of his age, on the field of Bosworth

Henry Tudor, Earl of Richmond, claiming to represent the Lancastrian line, landed at Milford Haven in June 1485, and being quickly joined by numerous adherents, was able on August 22 to defeat Richard who fell fighting gallantly

to the last. The desertion of Lord Stanley and the neutrality of the Earl of Northumberland secured the victory for Henry.

Civil Life ; Effects of the Wars of the Roses.—Although the political history of the Wars of the Roses is almost wholly filled by deeds of violence, we must not suppose that fighting was the sole occupation of the English for thirty years. The wars were in main personal conflicts between selfish nobles who were able to bring large bodies of retainers into the field, and the general population was little concerned in the struggle ; Towton being the only battle in which townspeople took a considerable part. In most places civil life went on as usual, and, in spite of disturbance and misgovernment, trade increased and wealth multiplied. The destruction of the baronage during the wars compelled the trading classes to rely more and more for protection on the crown and Royal Council, the only authority at all capable of keeping order. As the power of the king and council increased, that of Parliament diminished, and Edward IV was in a position almost to dispense with the parliamentary help which had been a necessity to Henry IV. Religion was little thought of, the heresies which had troubled Henry IV and Henry V were hidden away, and the clergy showed small interest in their duty. Secular learning acquired a powerful instrument by the invention of printing with movable types, introduced into England by William Caxton in the time of Edward IV.

LEADING DATES

Battle of Northampton (Yorkist victory)	1460
Battle of Wakefield (Richard, Duke of York, defeated and killed)	end of December 1460
Battle of Mortimer's Cross (Yorkist victory)	1461
Second battle of St Albans (Lancastrian victory)	1461
Battle of Towton (Yorkist victory)	1461
Proclamation and coronation of Edward IV of York	1461
Restoration of King Henry VI for six months	1470
Battles of Barnet and Tewkesbury (Yorkist victories)	1471
Death of Edward IV, nominal succession of Edward V, usurpation of Richard III	1483
Battle of Bosworth, death of Richard III	1485

CHAPTER XIII

TUDOR DYNASTY, UNION OF LANCASTER AND YORK,
HENRY VII, 1485-1509

Accession and Marriage of Henry VII.—The victor of Bosworth was saluted on the spot as king, and in November was formally accepted by Parliament as sovereign in his own right under the style of Henry VII. His claim to reign as the heir of Edward III had no substance, because he was descended from a son of John of Gaunt born out of wedlock, and acknowledged by Parliament (1397) as *legitimate only on the express condition that his issue should have no right of succession to the throne*. But all defects of title were cured by the victory of Bosworth and the assent of Parliament. Before the battle Henry had promised his supporters to end the feud between York and Lancaster by marrying Elizabeth, daughter of Edward IV, and the undoubted representative of the House of York. He carried out his promise, but was careful to defer the wedding until he had been crowned himself, so that nobody could say that he was only a King Consort ruling in his wife's right. In his heart he so hated the House of York that he was always cool to his queen, and purposely delayed her coronation until two years after their marriage.

The Reign of Henry VII the Close of an Epoch.—Henry VII being the first sovereign of the Tudor dynasty, it is natural to regard his accession as marking the beginning of a new epoch in English history, and most books follow the obvious course of treating the Tudor period as one and that of the Houses of York and Lancaster as another. But more mature consideration shows that Professor York Powell was right in drawing the 'deep, dividing line' at the death rather than the accession of Henry VII. That line marks the close of the 'Middle Ages, with their forms of life and thought and their systems of church and state, land and labour', and the beginning of a new life recast in the mould of changed religious

faith and novel learning 'So deep,' Professor York Powell observes, 'is this dividing line, that it is certain there was more in common between Alfred and Edward I, or Dunstan and William of Wickham,¹ though severed by centuries, than between Edward IV and Henry VIII, or Warwick and Wolsey, who are only a generation apart'

In this book, therefore, the reign of Henry VII is treated as the last act of the drama of the Wars of the Roses—as an epilogue, appendix, or supplement to the earlier history, rather than as the prologue or first chapter of the later. That decision has the support of Dr Gardiner, who concludes his account of the reign of Henry VII with the remark that 'it was his part to close an epoch of English history, not to open a fresh one'

Rebellion of Lord Lovel; Lambert Simnel.—The embers of the old dynastic struggle continued to smoulder and occasionally break into flame during the first twelve years of the reign, and Henry, consequently, found it necessary to keep in prison the Earl of Warwick son of the Duke of Clarence and nephew of Edward IV, until in 1499 he found an excuse for taking his life. The year after Henry's accession was disturbed by an unsuccessful insurrection headed by Lord Lovel, and in the next year a pretender appeared who professed to be the Earl of Warwick escaped from the Tower. With help from Ireland, which mostly favoured the Yorkist cause, the claimant joined battle at Stoke with the king's forces, was defeated, and was content to accept menial offices in the royal household. He was really Lambert Simnel son of an Oxford tradesman, and a mere tool in the hands of conspirators who did not believe in his pretensions.

The Strange Story of Perkin Warbeck.—Much more serious trouble was caused by a second pretender, now usually called Perkin Warbeck, who professed to be the young Duke of

¹ William of Wickham or Wykeham, Bishop of Winchester and Lord Chancellor in the reign of Edward III, founded Winchester College and New College, Oxford.

York, son of Edward IV (*ante*, p. 118) His attempts to disturb Henry's possession lasted from 1492 to 1497, owing to the support given by the Duchess of Burgundy, step mother of the reigning duke and sister of Edward IV, as well as by the King of Scotland who bestowed a relative of his own in marriage to the supposed duke After many strange adventures the pretender surrendered in 1497 An alleged attempt to escape from the Tower was punished with death, and the opportunity was taken to execute the Earl of Warwick, who was accused probably with no truth of joining in the attempt (1499) The proof is fairly strong that the claimant really was a Fleming named Warbeck or Osbeck, but the business is not free from mystery, detailed depositions published by Henry VII not being trustworthy because the king', as Bacon truly remarks 'had a fashion to create doubts rather than assurance' The judicial murder of the Earl of Warwick, although extremely unpopular, had the desired effect of securing the Tudor dynasty by the removal of the only serious claimant to the throne A rebellion of the Cornishmen in 1497 was indirectly connected with Perkin Warbeck's last attempt The rebels marched across England and camped at Blackheath, near London where they were easily surrounded and defeated with great slaughter

Foreign Affairs and Marriage Alliances—The king who took an active part in the intrigues of European politics, showed himself to be the equal in craft even of Louis XI of France and Ferdinand of Aragon¹ As Bacon observes 'he had met with an ally in Ferdinando of Aragon as fit for his turn as could be' The alliance with the Spanish sovereign was confirmed in November 1501 by the marriage of Henry's son, Arthur, Prince of Wales, with Katharine of Aragon,

¹ Louis XI of France son of Charles VII, whom Jeanne Darc had crowned at Rheims reigned from 1461 to 1483 He was a specially crafty prince. His habits are vividly described in Sir Walter Scott's novel *Quentin Durward*. Ferdinand King of Aragon, married Isabella of Castile and so united the provinces of Spain. He died in 1516 and was as cunning as Henry VII.

daughter of Ferdinand. When Prince Arthur died in 1502, his bride was transferred, with the sanction of the Pope, to his brother Henry—a transaction which had weighty consequences in the next reign. In the same year (1502) Henry's daughter Margaret was married to the King of Scotland, and so the foundation was laid for the union of the crowns of the two kingdoms a century later. The English people would have liked their king to renew the ancient claim on French territory, and were particularly anxious to prevent the union of the duchy of Brittany with the kingdom of France which was



SOVEREIGN OF HENRY VII

effected in 1491 by the marriage of King Charles VIII with the duchess Henry, while humouring his subjects by a pretence of war with France, was never in earnest in the business, preferring alliance with Spain, and being much more anxious to make the war 'pay itself' than to win glory by arms. 'He did but traffic with that war to make his return in money,' and was glad to be bought off in 1492, when the Peace of Etaples was signed.

King Henry's Love of Money.—Avarice, the master passion of Henry VII, dominated his policy, and in his later years his love of money became a scandal. He revived the evil system of 'benevolences', invented by Edward IV but abolished by Richard III (*ante*, pp 118, 120), and was ready to adopt any

means to fill his money-bags. His agents, Empson and Dudley, well knew how 'to crush treasure out of his subjects' purses by forfeitures upon penal laws', and kept an army of informers employed. Bacon saw a notebook in which the king had noted with his own hand the satisfaction of a royal claim for so small a sum as five marks, or about fifty rupees. He was resolved to destroy the influence of the few great nobles left after the Wars of the Roses by prohibiting 'livery and maintenance', that is to say, by forbidding noblemen to maintain large bodies of armed retainers wearing their livery or uniform, and when his rules were broken he extorted huge fines as penalties. The result of all his expedients was that 'golden showers poured down upon the king's treasury', so that when he died he left behind him £1,800,000 in cash equivalent to fifteen millions sterling more or less at the present day. Naturally the oppressions practised in order to swell the cash balance of the king made him very unpopular, especially in the latter years of his reign. His subjects, disgusted by his greed and the tricks of his agents, were hardly willing to give him due credit for the skill which he had shown in ending the Wars of the Roses, keeping the peace both at home and abroad, and devising valuable laws. His early advisers, Archbishop Morton and Bishop Fox, were men of character much higher than that of those on whom he relied later in life.

Growth of Royal Power; Decline of Parliament —The power of the crown continued to grow and that of Parliament to diminish during his reign. The invention of gunpowder and the gradual adoption of the use of artillery and fire-arms, or 'hand guns' as they were called greatly increased the strength of the central government of every country. In Henry's time bows and arrows were in course of being superseded by fire arms, and the possession of a train of artillery on one side only was enough to decide a battle. Artillery was used against the Cornish rebels at Blackheath (*ante*, p. 124) with deadly effect. As a rule nobody except the king had cannon, and

he thus gained an immense advantage. Henry's methods of raising money freed him from dependence on the liberality of Parliament, and men began to be accustomed to government by the Privy Council rather than by Parliament. Henry VII for the first time gave regular form to the Court of Star Chamber, consisting of a committee of the Privy Council aided by two judges. That court dealt specially with acts of violence or wrongdoing by powerful persons, and therefore not suitable to be tried in the ordinary criminal courts. At first the court was useful, but later, under the Stuarts, it became an instrument of tyranny.

Merchant Navy and Trade.—Henry encouraged the merchant navy by granting a 'bounty', or remission of customs duties, in favour of the builders of a new ship making its first voyage. He worked hard to enlarge opportunities for British trade with Venice, Flanders, and Germany. He also patronized the American explorations of Sebastian Gabato (Cabot), a Venetian adventurer who sailed from Bristol. New worlds were then being opened to trade by the discoveries of Columbus and others in America (1492–1504), and by the Portuguese voyages to India (1486–1510).

Royal Navy.—The royal or war navy also received attention. The introduction of cannon on board the ships made it necessary to build broad, heavy vessels, with plenty of room. The largest vessel of Henry VII's fleet was the *Regent*, of 600 tons, copied from a French model. Henry also built at Portsmouth, on the south coast, which is still the principal naval station in England, the first dry dock for the repair of his ships.

Architecture.—The art of architecture was cultivated with success. The cessation of civil war largely dispensed with the need of castles to live in, and people began to build houses, designed for comfort rather than defence. Many handsome colleges and chapels were erected in a rich style. One of the most notable is Henry VII's Chapel at Westminster, in which his son constructed a splendid tomb, where, to quote

Bacon's words, the king 'lieth buried . . . in one of the stateliest and daintiest monuments of Europe, both for the chapel and the sepulchre . . . So that he dwelleth more richly dead, in the monument of his tomb, than he did alive in Richmond, or any of his palaces'

Death and Character of Henry VII.—On April 22, 1509, the king died in the fifty fourth year of his age . . . He was a man, to quote Bacon again, 'sad (i.e. grave), serious, full of thoughts and secret observations, and full of notes and memorials of his own hand, especially touching persons . . . a wonder for wise men . . . wholly given to his affairs . . . For his pleasures, there is no news of them . . . and he was rather studious than learned . . . He gained 'a height of reputation for cunning and policy', and was a prince who 'loved his own will and his own way, as one that revered himself, and would reign indeed'

'He deserves,' according to Dr Gardiner, 'to be reckoned among the kings who have accomplished much for England. If he was not chivalrous or imaginative, neither was the age in which he lived . . . His contemporaries needed a chief constable to keep order, and he gave them what they needed'

LEADING DATES

Accession of Henry VII	1485
Lambert Simnel pretender	1487
Peace of Étaples with France	1492
Parkin Warbeck's attempts	1492-7
Cornish rebellion	1497
Execution of the Earl of Warwick	1499
Marriage of Prince Arthur with Katharine of Aragon	1501
Marriage of Princess Margaret to King of Scotland	1502
Death of Henry VII	April 1509

BOOK IV

HENRY VIII TO THE REVOLUTION

CHAPTER XIV

HENRY VIII, EDWARD VI, MARY I, 1509-58

Joy at Accession of Henry VIII.—All England rejoiced and was glad when Henry, Prince of Wales, took his seat on the vacant throne. The young king was in his eighteenth year, handsome, gay, extravagant, skilled in all manly exercises, a thorough Englishman in body and mind, and withal an accomplished scholar, a man as different as could be from his austere father. It is no wonder that the accession of such a prince was hailed with delight as an event full of promise for the kingdom, but it is matter of wonder that Henry's conduct in later years never wholly destroyed his early popularity.

Marriage; Execution of Empson and Dudley—He lost no time in completing his marriage with Katharine of Aragon, the bride-widow of his brother, and in earning popular applause by procuring the execution of Empson and Dudley, the agents of his father's extortions. Charges of treason were got up against them, and conviction easily followed upon accusation. Henry in the course of his reign shed much blood, but almost always made use of the forms of legal procedure to serve as a cloak to his personal vengeance or politic designs.

Foreign Affairs; Battle of Flodden, 1513.—Little else worthy of note happened until 1512. At that time the three great powers on the Continent were France, Spain, and the Germanic Empire, all engaged in constant intrigues, one against the other, in which the Pope took an active part. Henry, having decided to join Ferdinand of Spain, his father-in-law, and the Pope against Louis XII, King of France,

invaded that country without success. Next year, 1513, he repeated the invasion in person, and won an engagement in Flanders, nicknamed the Battle of the Spurs, because the *French ran away and used only their spurs*. More important was the war with the Scotch allies of France. The English under the Earl of Surrey met the Scots at Flodden, just inside the English border, and utterly defeated them with great slaughter, killing the king James IV, and a host of his nobles (1513).¹ In 1519 Charles V of Spain, grandson of Ferdinand was elected Germanic Emperor, so that the continental powers were reduced from three to two, and Henry, during the rest of his reign, had always to consider whether he should support France or Germany and Spain. Peace was made with France, and the French and English kings met in 1520 at Ardres in northern France. The place of meeting was adorned with such splendour that it was known as '*The Field of the Cloth of Gold*'. But war with France again broke out in 1522, without, however, any result of importance.

Early Career of Wolsey—During all these years Henry did not seem to pay much attention to business leaving the conduct of affairs in the hands of his minister, Wolsey. Thomas Wolsey, the son of a tradesman, had been ordained a clergyman early in life, and like many other nominal clerics of that period, had given all his attention to worldly affairs. He had been employed as a confidential agent by Henry VII, who liked his servants to be professional officials of lowly origin, and under the new king made himself so useful that he was given rapid promotion and made a bishop, or lord of the Church, becoming extremely rich. The useless wars with France and the extravagance of the court cost so much money that all the cash gathered by Henry VII had been spent and the king was hard pressed. In 1523 Wolsey tried to raise an immense sum by arbitrary means. His proceedings caused so much discontent that they were stopped and the king had to do without the money.

¹ The story may be read agreeably in Sir Walter Scott's poem, *Marmion*.



HENRY VIII

From the portrait by Holbein, in the possession of the Barber-Surgeons' Company of London

Predominance of Charles V from 1525.—The situation on the Continent was changed completely in 1525 by the battle fought at Pavia in Italy, in which Francis I, King of France was not only defeated but taken prisoner by the Emperor Charles V, who thus became the leading power in Europe. Some two years later the imperial troops sacked Rome (1527). These events caused the English Government to fear that Charles V was growing too strong and to think that it might be wise to support France.

Beginning of the Reformation.—Other matters also had much influence on the conduct of the King of England. One of these was the beginning of the movement known as the Reformation, directed against the Pope's claims to exercise authority in matters of state, and intended to reform the evil lives of many of the clergy, as well as to change certain *doctrines officially taught which the reformers believed to be erroneous*. Inasmuch as the consequences of the Reformation determined the whole course of English history down to the Revolution of 1688, the nature of the change of religion effected in the time of the Tudors requires explanation in some detail. In England the efforts made by Wycliffe, Sir John Oldcastle, and others during the fifteenth century (*ante* pp. 99-108) were so far suppressed by the persecution under Henry IV and Henry V that they had produced little visible fruit, although many men's minds had been secretly prepared for change. The translation of the Bible into English begun by Wycliffe and continued by various disciples certainly had a profound influence upon thought, but the effects of the Wycliffite teaching were more apparent on the Continent than in England.

The Renaissance.—Towards the close of the fifteenth century the intellect of all European nations was deeply stirred by the gradual revival of Greek learning, which was stimulated by the dispersion of Greek books and scholars caused in 1453 by the Turkish occupation of Constantinople, or Rûm, the capital of the Byzantine or Eastern Roman

Empire That revival of the study of ancient Greek philosophy and literature carried with it a more exact learning of Latin, which in a corrupt form had been for centuries the language of the learned in every country of Europe. The Greek and Roman literature thus brought to light during the second half of the fifteenth century, and made easily accessible by the invention of printing with movable types (*ante*, p. 121), was, as it were, a new world for the exploration of students, who had been restricted for ages to narrow courses of study, usually confined to theology and law. The novel learning, greeted everywhere with enthusiasm, quickly had the effect of disturbing current religious beliefs, which were seen to be difficult to defend on purely reasonable grounds. The revival of Greek and Roman or Latin studies is often spoken of as the Renaissance or Renascence—a word meaning 're birth'.

General Spirit of Inquiry.—Thus it happened that during the reign of Henry VIII a general spirit of inquiry was abroad. In every European land a strong disposition was felt to question the validity of old-established faiths, to compare the actions of official teachers of religion with their professed doctrines, and to dispute the authority claimed by popes and bishops.

Martin Luther; Indulgences; John Calvin.—In England the revival of learning and the spirit of inquiry into religious matters and the government of the Church had been checked by the Wars of the Roses. In Germany people had had a little more leisure to think, so that the honour of starting the Reformation of the sixteenth century fell to a German monk, named Martin Luther. The popes had adopted the evil practice of professing to sell pardons of sins for money. Such pardons called 'indulgences', were openly sold, and ordinary people were simple enough to believe that they could evade the inevitable penalties of sin by paying the Pope¹. Luther saw the folly and wickedness of proceedings of the kind, and in 1517 published a formal protest against

¹ No Indian believer in *Karma* could be induced to buy an 'indulgence'.

them, which may be considered as the first act of the Reformation. A little later, John Calvin, a Frenchman residing at Geneva in Switzerland, worked out a system of Protestant theology differing considerably from Luther's teaching, and established a form of Church government in Geneva which was adopted by the Scotch reformers, and much admired by many Englishmen. His action divided the reformers into two main bodies, Calvinists and Lutherans.

Origin of the Term Protestant.—A great turmoil followed Luther's doings in Germany, where princes and people separated into two parties, one approving of Luther's principles and action, the other denouncing him as a heretic only fit to be burned alive. King Henry of England, who had studied theology in his youth, joined in the fray and published a book against Luther which earned for him from the Pope the title of Defender of the Faith. That title (*Fides Defensor* in Latin) still appears on the coinage as part of the official style of the King of England although the withdrawal of the kingdom from obedience to the Pope was, as we shall see presently, the work of King Henry himself. Luther's principles were reduced to a formula in the Augsburg Confession of 1530, and about that time his followers began to be called Protestants as *protesting* against the decrees issued by the Roman Church in condemnation of Luther.

Political Origin of the English Reformation—The turmoil in Germany made itself heard in England where many people began to feel doubts both about the right of the popes to the authority which they claimed and the truth of certain doctrines which they insisted that everybody must accept under pain of being burnt alive in this world and damned in the next. In England, as in Germany, a reformation of some sort was bound to come as the necessary result of growing liberty of thought, but the natural course of the English reform movement was turned aside and hastened by the personal interference of King Henry, who for his own private reasons forced the nation to withdraw from obedience to the

Pope of Rome. He did not intend to do more. There is no reason to believe that he was really eager to reform the morals of the clergy, and it is certain that he was strongly opposed to changes of doctrine. But when he destroyed the papal jurisdiction in England he broke down the barrier which held back the reforming spirits, and thus, without intending it, started a genuine reformation of morals and doctrine, such as had been started in Germany by Luther's whole-hearted, conscientious protest. The German Reformation, religious in origin, became political; the English Reformation, political in origin, became religious, and then again more political than religious.

Desire of King Henry to Change his Wife.—Henry, as we have seen, had married his brother's widow, Katharine of Aragon, immediately after his accession. Prince Arthur was still a boy at the time of his death, and it is possible that his marriage had never been consummated. However that may be, the irregular union of the widow with Henry, which was contrary to Church law, had been formally permitted by the Pope, and Katharine's second marriage was regarded by everybody as lawful. Henry had lived with her for many years, and she had borne to him several children, of whom only one, Princess Mary, was alive. The King, who earnestly desired a son, had no chance of obtaining one from his wife, and so began to think of means whereby he might get rid of her and marry again¹. But that was not an easy thing to do, because Katharine, who indignantly refused to agree, was the aunt of the Emperor Charles V, the greatest potentate in Europe, and the Pope, who alone could dissolve the marriage, was very unlikely to consent to do so—in fact, dared not provoke the emperor by insulting his relative.

Henry's Motives.—In the year 1527, that in which the troops of Charles V sacked Rome, Henry was hotly in love with a lady of his court, named Anne Boleyn, who was

¹ Such a difficulty, of course, could not arise in Asia. But no Christian Church permits a man to have two lawful wives at once.

ambitious to become Queen of England Henry, influenced by his passion for Anne, her ambition, his weariness of Katharine, who was six years older than he, his desire for a son, and his jealousy of the overgrown power of Charles V, resolved that somehow or other he would rid himself of Katharine and marry Anne That personal resolve of Henry VIII is, as a matter of fact, the foundation of the English Reformation, the development of which in its early stages was wholly directed by the king's will, on which purely religious motives had little influence Henry made a great show of feeling conscientious objections to the union accepted by him for eighteen years without protest, but it is sufficiently plain that if he had had a son living, and had not met Anne Boleyn, his conscience would not have troubled him in 1527

Fall of Wolsey, 1529-30.—It is needless to follow in detail the shameful intrigues by which Henry sought to find some legal excuse for dismissing his faithful consort, or the various attempts made to force the Pope to gratify his desire The Pope went so far as to send an Italian cardinal as Legate to England to hear the case along with Wolsey, now a cardinal,¹ but finally ordered that the cause must be tried in Rome Wolsey was ruined by his failure to obtain from the Pope what the king wanted, and was suddenly cast down from his high estate, and stripped of his honours and riches, the nominal charge against him being that he had broken the law by acting as Pope's Legate without the formal sanction of Henry (1529) Next year (1530) he died, the victim of his heartless master

The King made Head of the Church—Parliament, which had not met for seven years, was now summoned to carry out the royal wishes and proved to be willing, the elections having been arranged so as to secure that the members should be the nominees of the government The clergy were heavily

¹ The seventy cardinals, who form the Sacred College at Rome and by whom and from whom the Pope is elected, are eminent priests selected by the Pope to aid him in the government of the Church

fined, certain moneys payable to the Pope were withheld, and in 1534 Henry, by the Act of Supremacy, declared himself Head of the Church, definitely giving up all obedience to the Pope, and making it treason to deny the king's right to do what he pleased with the Church. Two men of the highest eminence, Sir Thomas More, ex Chancellor, and Bishop Fisher, besides many of lesser note, were executed because they could not accept the new state of things with a clear conscience. Henry's action in obtaining the Act of Supremacy finds a curiously close Indian parallel forty-five years later in the extortion by Akbar from the Mohammedan Ulamā of a decree to the effect that when the doctors (*mujtahids*) differed on a religious question His Majesty's ruling should be binding (1579 A.D., 987 A.H.). The Pope replied to Henry's defiance (December 1535) by not only excommunicating him (*ante*, p. 65), but also declaring him deposed from the throne. Akbar was more fortunate in having no Pope to fear. In Europe in the sixteenth century a Pope's decree of deposition, although it could not be enforced directly, was a serious trouble to a sovereign, being interpreted as giving authority to all persons rebelliously inclined to act with a clear conscience, even to the extent of killing the excommunicated prince. In Elizabeth's reign a similar decree caused her much danger.

Execution of Anne Boleyn; Jane Seymour.—Henry, not having been able to induce the Pope to annul his marriage with Katharine, took the law into his own hands and went through a form of secret marriage with Anne Boleyn (January 1533). Archbishop Cranmer was pliant enough both to annul the marriage with Katharine and to sanction that with Anne, who was then acknowledged as queen¹. She bore one daughter, afterwards the great Queen Elizabeth. Anne was

¹ The proceedings in relation to Katharine are commonly, though inaccurately, described as the divorce. They were really intended to declare that no valid marriage between her and Henry had ever existed. Divorce means a release from a valid marriage. Later, Cranmer was base enough to declare the marriage with Anne to have been void.

not allowed to enjoy her grandeur for long Henry tired of her, and taking advantage of some slight levity in her conduct, trumped up false charges of adultery, and even incest, against her, and executed her in May 1536 The next day, with disgusting haste, he married Jane Seymour, who in the following year gave him the desired son, afterwards Edward VI. She died a few days later, from the effects of the king's want of thought for her delicate state of health

Dissolution of the Monasteries.—Meantime Henry continued to fight the Pope In 1535 commissioners were sent to inquire into the state of the monasteries They found plenty of real abuses and probably invented others On the strength of their report the smaller monasteries were first destroyed, and then (1537) the rest The greater part of the immense spoil went either to the king's treasury or in grants to his courtiers, who were thus bound by self interest to support his tyranny The Pope's influence in the kingdom was much weakened by the destruction of the wealthy and powerful religious orders, which had been under his control

The 'Pilgrimage of Grace'.—The king's defiance of the Pope, his ferocious attack on the monasteries, and the oppressive effects of the enclosure of common lands by powerful landlords caused great wrath in the north of England, where a dangerous rising, known as the 'Pilgrimage of Grace', was attempted Early in 1537 it was suppressed with much bloodshed, even the abbots (*mahants* of India) being ruthlessly hanged

Ireland.—A rising in Ireland, headed by the Fitzgeralds, was crushed with equal cruelty, and a beginning was made in the conquest of the whole island, where the English power had been for a long time confined to a small area in the east, called 'the Pale' Henry assumed the title of King, instead of Lord of Ireland (1541), in order to mark his independence of the Pope, whose predecessor had presumed to grant the island to Henry II (*ante*, p 66)

Thomas Cromwell.—The instrument used by the king

throughout the reign of terror thus briefly outlined was a man of low origin named Thomas Cromwell, who won the royal favour by giving advice suited to Henry's taste and carrying out a policy of robbery and murder without pity or scruple. Cromwell was made practically the Prime Minister (equivalent to the *vazir* of Asia), and while he held his master's favour could do what he pleased with the lives and property of the greatest nobles and prelates. He was created Earl of Essex. The minister, being inclined to support the cause of the Lutheran Protestants (*ante*, p. 134), was anxious to persuade Henry to ally himself with the German princes who had taken the Protestant side of the religious quarrel. In pursuit of this scheme he induced the king to marry as fourth wife, a German Protestant princess Anne of Cleves. But Henry did not like either her or the Protestant alliance, and managed to have the marriage annulled on frivolous pretexts. The lady was content and accepted a pension. The king was annoyed with Cromwell for his share in the business and having made as much use of him as he wanted cast him aside and caused him to be executed on a false charge of treason (1540).

Fifth and Sixth Marriages—In the same year (1540) Henry married his fifth consort Katharine Howard, a cousin of Anne Boleyn, who was put forward by the Catholic party. Eighteen months later she suffered the same fate as Anne, but with more reason. Once again, for the sixth time, the king married, his choice being Katharine Parr, Lady Latimer, already twice a widow. She survived her terrible royal husband although not without incurring danger, and after his death married Sir Thomas (Lord) Seymour of Sudeley, who was suspected of poisoning her, and was himself executed soon afterwards on a charge of treason. The scandalous record of the marriages of Henry VIII is thus completed. In every case the unhappy ladies concerned were made use of by intriguing politicians or selfish nobles who hoped for some gain from each marriage and cared nothing for the misery of the victims.

Wars with France and Scotland.—The closing years of the reign were largely occupied by useless and ill planned wars with France and Scotland, which had no lasting results of importance, while causing much bloodshed and distress. The Scots suffered a severe defeat at Solway Moss (1512), which was followed almost immediately by the death of their king, James V, who left his infant daughter, Mary, the heritage of his disorderly kingdom. The French lost the port of Boulogne, which remained in English hands for some years. Edinburgh was taken with the aid of a powerful English fleet (1544). *The French, having made an unsuccessful attempt to invade England, were willing to come to terms, and peace was arranged in 1546.* These warlike adventures cost much money, and Henry was reduced to raising funds by the shameful expedient of debasing the coinage, so that coins professing to be silver were diminished in weight and contained base metal to the extent of half or even two thirds.

Settlement of the Succession.—Parliament accepted the king's wishes for the settlement of the succession to the throne which were that Prince Edward, son of Jane Seymour, should succeed first, and after him and his descendants, if any, the Princess Mary, daughter of Katharine of Aragon, after her, the Princess Elizabeth, daughter of Anne Boleyn, and finally the descendants of Mary, the king's younger sister, who had married the Duke of Suffolk as her second husband. The settlement excluded the Scotch line descended from Margaret, the king's elder sister, which in the end came to the throne in the person of James I.

Death of Henry VIII, January 1547.—At the beginning of 1547 Henry, who had long been in bad health, died. One of his last acts was the arbitrary execution of the young Earl of Surrey on frivolous accusations of treason, a fitting close to his tyrannical reign. Henry's rival, King Francis I of France, died two months later, and Martin Luther had passed away a year earlier.

The Masterful Will of Henry.—It has been necessary to

relate with some fullness the unpleasant history of Henry VIII because his reign left a deep impress on English history. The course of events was determined to an extraordinary extent by the king's masterful will. Everything that was done bears the stamp of his personal action. No other English sovereign has ever enjoyed power so absolute, which in his latter years was equal to that of a Czar of Russia or an Asiatic Sultan. His purely personal desire to exchange Katharine of Aragon for Anne Boleyn undoubtedly brought about the Reformation, which during its early stages in England was a political, not a religious revolution. The hateful story of Henry's marriages is so closely interwoven with great affairs of permanent interest that it is impossible to neglect the personal details.

The Sources of his Power.—He effected his purpose of freeing the English Government and Church from all interference by the Pope, and in so doing carried out completely a policy which earlier kings and Parliaments had attempted with poor success (*ante* pp 63, 65-98). His bold defiance of foreign authority undoubtedly was pleasing to a large part of the English people, and that fact partly explains the strange general submission of the nation to his tyranny. It would seem as if the common people did not feel much interest in the tragic fate of the queens, nobles, bishops and ministers who were sacrificed so freely to Henry's lust, wrath, or policy. Many supporters of the government were bought over by being given a share in the plunder of the monasteries. Henry was careful to see that the classes which supplied members of Parliament should be those to draw profit rather than loss from his violence, and that elections should be so managed as to secure submissive members. Whenever popular ill will began to show its teeth he threw to it a minister to be devoured, and he shifted the blame from his own shoulders to those of the victim, while giving the people the satisfaction of revenge. The man who could watch from the towers of Windsor for the signal announcing the execution of one wife, and next

day marry another, was not to be deterred by any feeling of pity or gratitude from sending to the block a faithful servant for whom he had no further use, and whose death would be welcome to his people.

His imperious will forced obedience from everybody high and low, and the tremendous self assertion which enabled him to treat a duke or cardinal with as little ceremony as a groom evidently produced the impression that resistance was hopeless. His remarkable bodily and mental qualities also help to explain his success. He looked every inch a king and in his youth and early manhood was the match of any member of his court in manly exercises. He was well read and endowed with intelligence sufficient to enable him to choose able ministers and to exact from each all the service that he could give. A recent historian observes that '*his selfishness, flagrant as it was, did not wholly absorb him, behind it there was a sense of the greatness of his office, a desire to make England great*'. That belief in the high destiny of the English kingship gave him the strength to withstand king emperor, or pope, while his people, proud to know that their ruler would not bend the knee to any foreign potentate, stood behind him, and endured his capricious tyranny.

The Navy.—Henry showed his sagacity and knowledge of the English temperament by his care for the navy, in which he took the deepest interest, even inventing a model ship himself. The efforts of early kings—Alfred, Edward III, Henry V—had produced little lasting effect, and the foundation of a regular navy was deferred until the time of Henry VII. His son added eighty-five ships to the royal navy by purchase, prize-taking, and building, arming his vessels with heavy guns, and arranging a suitable administration. A recent specialist author declares that he may be said to have 'created' the English navy, 'and it is hardly an exaggeration to say that the Spanish war at the end of the century was won by him, for Elizabeth never showed any real understanding of

sea power' The recognition of the navy as the 'especial national arm' is due to Henry VIII, and that fact alone is enough to mark the extreme importance of his reign.

Accession of Edward VI; Scotch War; Rebellions—In accordance with the settlement made by the late king and Parliament, the Prince of Wales, a boy nine years old, son of Jane Seymour, was proclaimed at once as Edward VI. His mother's brother, Edward Seymour, became guardian of his person and Protector of the kingdom assuming the title of Duke of Somerset. The Protector entered on a war with Scotland and defeated the Scots at Pinkie (1547). During the two years following he had to crush two rebellions—one in Devonshire and Cornwall due to popular anger at the suppression of the monasteries and dislike of the Protector's leaning to a Protestant form of religion, and the other, a more formidable rising of the peasants in the eastern counties, led by a man named Robert Ket. German and Italian hired troops were used in the suppression of both risings. The Protector's brother, Lord Seymour of Sudeley, was executed for alleged treason.

Distress of the Poor—At that time, as for some years previously during the reign of Henry VIII, the poor were suffering intense misery. The extension of sheep runs to supply the wool needed for the profitable trade with Flanders threw many labouring men out of employment. The rights of the people in the open common lands were largely encroached on by enclosures made by great lords enriched by the spoil of the monasteries, the suppression of which was a loss to the poor, who had been helped by the charities of the monks. The prevailing distress due to those causes and others was much increased by the long continued dishonest debasement of the coinage, carried still further in the new reign. The coins of Edward VI, containing three fourths alloy and only one-fourth silver, were the worst money ever struck in England. The kingdom became full of sturdy beggars, starving and ready for violence. Somerset showed




Thomas Cromwell



Henry VIII



John and Marg



Mary Queen of Scots

TUDOR MEDALS

some sympathy with the poor, but no effective steps to remedy the evils were taken until Elizabeth's reign. Edward VI's ministers, excepting Somerset, knew nothing better than to imprison and hang.

Fall of Somerset.—In 1550 the Duke of Somerset, who had roused the enmity of the nobles by taking the side of the oppressed poor, was turned out of office by John Dudley, Earl of Warwick, a scheming, tricky politician, who took the title of Duke of Northumberland. Two years later Somerset, although uncle of the king, suffered the usual fate of a fallen minister in those times and was beheaded. During the government of Northumberland, Boulogne (*ante*, p. 140) was recovered by France.

The Protestant Reformation.—The boy king was a convinced Protestant (*ante*, p. 131), and in the course of his short reign the English Reformation assumed a marked Protestant character, the doctrines, worship and service-books of the old religion being extensively altered, so that the English or Anglican Church became really separate from that of Rome, which is described by its members as the Catholic, and by others as the Roman Catholic Church. The policy of Henry VIII, aiming merely at withdrawal from the jurisdiction of the Pope, while leaving everything else, except the monasteries, as before, was now given up.

Death of Edward VI; Lady Jane Grey, 1553.—Northumberland married his son, Guilford Dudley, to Lady Jane Grey, a young girl granddaughter of Mary, younger sister of Henry VIII, and persuaded King Edward, who was in weak health, to make a will contrary to that of his father, excluding his half sisters, Mary and Elizabeth, and naming Lady Jane as his immediate successor. Parliament was not consulted, as it ought to have been. Edward died in the summer of 1553. Northumberland at once proclaimed his daughter-in-law, Lady Jane Grey, as queen, and she occupied the throne nominally for twelve days¹. But the nation would not

¹ Lady Jane Grey is not reckoned among the sovereigns of England,

accept the change made without proper authority, and was determined that the Princess Mary should succeed as arranged by Henry VIII and Parliament. She quickly raised a force of 30,000 men, which Northumberland could not resist, and was gladly accepted as sovereign (July 1553).

Accession of Queen Mary I; a Rebellion.—Mary had the support of almost all England, of the Protestants as well as the Catholics, and nobody resented the execution of Northumberland, which followed quickly upon the queen's accession. Lady Jane Grey, the innocent victim of the ambition of others, was spared for the moment, but in the following year she and her husband were executed in consequence of an unsuccessful rebellion, prompted by the news of the intended Spanish marriage, which was extremely unpopular, and headed by her father, the Duke of Suffolk, and Sir Thomas Wyatt. The object of their movement was to depose Mary, and put her Protestant half sister, Elizabeth, the daughter of Anne Boleyn, on the throne. Mary, of course, regarded Elizabeth as illegitimate and would not allow her to come to court. The princess managed to save her life by cautious submission.

The Spanish Marriage; Submission to Rome.—In the same year (1554), Queen Mary, now thirty-eight years of age, married her cousin Philip of Spain, the son and heir apparent of Charles V, who was at that time the most powerful sovereign of Europe¹. Mary, a passionately devout adherent of the Roman Church, was intensely anxious for the union with Philip, who was equally bigoted and hostile to Protestantism. Her third Parliament, summoned after the marriage in the autumn of 1554, sanctioned a formal reconciliation with the Roman Church. Mary's reign being regarded as beginning on the day of her brother's death (July 6, 1553).

¹ Queen Mary, as daughter of Katharine of Aragon, sister of Charles V, was first cousin of Philip. European custom allows the marriage of first cousins, which Hindus would consider incestuous. The emperor, Charles V, resigned the throne of Spain, &c., in January 1556, and shortly afterwards retired into private life. His son Philip succeeded him as King of Spain, but not as emperor.

Pope and submitted to receive 'absolution' from Cardinal Pole, the Legate,¹ but steadily refused to give up the Church lands confiscated by Henry VIII. The marriage continued to be unpopular, and the people did not like the way in which Mary followed the guidance of the Spanish ambassador in foreign politics. Philip, who was much younger than the queen, did not care about her, and had married her only from policy.

Fierce Persecution of Protestants—Her two most ardent desires were for a son and the rooting out of Protestant heresy. The first was denied her, and she died childless. But she was able at least to attempt to carry out her second purpose. She induced Parliament to renew the statute of Henry IV for burning heretics (*ante*, p. 107), and entered on a course of deliberate persecution which has earned for her a hateful memory as 'Bloody Mary', and has had more influence than anything else in turning the mass of Englishmen away from the Romish Church and making them zealous Protestants. During the short remainder of her reign nearly three hundred persons were burnt alive, thirteen comprising two women, being consumed in one day at Stratford le Bow. Her victims included four bishops Hooper, Ferrars, Latimer, and Ridley, besides Archbishop Cranmer, who had pronounced her mother's marriage to be void, and had done more than any other man to give the English Reformation its peculiar form.

Loss of Calais—In 1557 Philip involved England in a most unpopular war with France, which resulted in the loss of Calais, won by Edward III more than two centuries earlier, and the last remnant of the British dominion in France, formerly so extensive in the days of Henry II and Henry V.

Death of the Queen—In November 1558 the queen died—

¹ The Roman Catholic Church claims the power to remit by a formal act of 'absolution' the penalties which would otherwise be imposed by God upon a sinner. The absolution can be granted only to the sinner who makes full confession of his fault. The Legate was given full powers by the Pope.

a miserable, unhappy woman, disappointed in her hopes, hated by her subjects, and knowing well that her policy was likely to be reversed by her successor

LEADING DATES

Accession of Henry VIII, marriage with Katharine of Aragon	1509
Battle of Flodden	1513
First public protest by Martin Luther	1517
Battle of Pavia	1525
Fall of Wolsey	1529
Marriage with Anne Boleyn	1533
Act of Supremacy	1534
Dissolution of the monasteries	1536-8
Fall of Thomas Cromwell	1540
Henry proclaimed King of Ireland	1541
Defeat of the Scots at Solway Moss	1542
Death of the king	Jan 28, 1547
Accession of Edward VI defeat of the Scots at Pinkie	1547
Fall of Duke of Somerset	1550
Death of Edward VI Lady Jane Grey	1553
Accession of Queen Mary I	1553
Her marriage rebellion of Wyatt and Suffolk	1554
Persecution of Protestants	1553-8
Loss of Calais	1557
Death of the queen	Nov 1558

CHAPTER XV

ELIZABETH 1558-1603

Accession of Elizabeth—Mary when on her death bed, assented to the succession of her sister, which was warmly welcomed by all classes. King Philip of Spain felt no scruples about at once asking Elizabeth to take the late queen's place as his wife an offer which she felt no hesitation in refusing. In the course of a long life she never met the suitor to whom she dared to trust her person and kingdom.

Her Difficulties.—Elizabeth, a girl twenty five years of age, who, since her father's death, had found difficulty in keeping her head on her shoulders, now as queen had to face dangers



QUEEN ELIZABETH

From an engraving published in 1831, after a painting in the Collection of the Marquess of Exeter

more than enough to shake the nerves of the strongest man. As the daughter of Anne Boleyn with whom her father had gone through the form of marriage during the lifetime of Katharine of Aragon, she was illegitimate in the eyes of all persons who still respected the Pope's authority and refused to recognize Cranmer's annulment of her father's first marriage. The claimant with the clearest right to the throne by descent undoubtedly was her cousin Mary, Queen of Scots, the granddaughter of Henry VIII's elder sister, and this fact exposed Elizabeth to constant peril.

Henry's revolt from obedience to Rome, if popular with one section of her subjects, was hateful to another, so that Elizabeth was obliged from the first to try and find devices for carrying on the business of government without offending too deeply the feelings of either party. Matters were further complicated, specially by the unpopular Spanish alliance inherited from her sister, and more generally by the *state of foreign politics* in all countries on the continent of Europe. We shall see with what skill she managed to save her self and her country from perils of every kind and after a reign of nearly forty five years to win the love of her subjects and the respect of foreigners leaving to her Scotch successor a rich, prosperous, and victorious realm illustrious in literature and learning unhappy Ireland always being excepted.

Her Ministers.—Like her father, the queen knew how to choose good ministers and servants, and unlike him she did not lightly withdraw her confidence. For forty years (1558-98) she gave it to William Cecil whom she raised to the peerage as Lord Burleigh, or Burghly, but, while making full use of his tried wisdom, she kept the control of affairs in her own hand, so that the policy of the reign was hers, not his.¹ During many years Burleigh was ably assisted by Sir Francis Walsingham (died 1590), whose special business was the

¹ The late Marquess of Salisbury, the eminent minister of Queen Victoria, was descended from Lord Burleigh and his sons also are distinguished in public life.

management of the secret service, a most essential department of government in an age of plots and conspiracies. Elizabeth succeeded in attracting the zealous loyalty of her officers, especially those of the navy, who won for her the ever memorable victory over the apparently invincible power of Spain.

Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity.—In the year (1559) after her succession peace was made with France, and the position of the sovereign in regard to the Church at home was settled by the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity. Although she dropped the irritating phrase 'Head of the Church' from the royal style, she retained supreme control over the appointment of bishops, and completely excluded all interference by the Pope in the affairs of her kingdom. She had no desire to persecute heresy as such, being willing to allow every man to believe or disbelieve what he liked, but in accordance with the universal practice of the age she insisted on uniformity in public worship. In those days every government in Europe believed that it was its duty to recognize only one form of religion in each state, and to require outward conformity with the authorized ceremonies of worship. In 1583 the queen established the Court of High Commission to enforce the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity. In practice the authority of the Court was exercised by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and often in a very oppressive manner both in Elizabeth's time and during the reigns of James I and Charles I.

Expulsion of French Troops from Scotland—During two-thirds of the reign the most pressing danger to the security of Elizabeth's throne and the peace of her kingdom was from the side of Scotland, which had been the ally of France since the days of Edward I (1295). At the time of Elizabeth's accession French troops were stationed at Leith, near Edinburgh, with the design of strengthening the Roman Catholic party in Scotland and threatening England. In 1560 Elizabeth sent up a strong fleet which forced the Frenchmen to go home and to recognize her title to the English throne.

Mary, Queen of Scots.—Mary, the young 'Queen of Scots', had been married to Francis II, King of France and was only eighteen years of age when he died at the close of 1560. In the next year (1561) she returned to her native kingdom where she spent seven stormy years. We cannot tell in these pages the strange story of those years, a subject of never ending dispute. The country was torn asunder by religious quarrels between the Reformers and the Roman Catholics, which were turned to their own purposes by ambitious nobles caring nothing for religion. In 1565 Mary married as her second husband her cousin Henry Darnley. The marriage proved unhappy and in the year following Darnley murdered his wife's favourite secretary in her presence. Later in the year her only son afterwards James VI of Scotland and I of England was born. Early in 1567 the country was startled by the news that the house where Darnley lodged had been blown up by gunpowder and that his corpse had been found outside. It was clear that the crime was the work of a noble man named James Bothwell whom the queen greatly favoured, and it is practically certain that she approved of it. A few months later she permitted Bothwell to carry her off, and after divorcing his own wife to marry her. This outrage on decency was too much for her people who forced Mary to resign the throne in favour of her infant son and condemned her to life long imprisonment in Lochleven Castle. In 1568 she escaped and raised some troops but was easily defeated and driven into England where she remained as Elizabeth's prisoner and torment until her execution nearly nineteen years later.

Rival Policies—During the period of Mary's stay in Scotland the struggle between the adherents of the Protestant and Roman Catholic forms of religions divided Europe. In the Netherlands the modern Holland and Belgium then a province under the Spanish monarchy the Duke of Alva the governor and general of King Philip II tried to stamp out Protestantism by fearful massacres and cruelties. Burleigh the minister of Elizabeth desired that she should become openly the leader

of the Protestant cause in Europe, grant effective help to the Netherlanders against Spain and give up Mary to the Scotch, who certainly would have put her to death. The English Roman Catholics, on the other hand, desired peace with Spain and the recognition of Mary as heir to the English throne, and their view received support from merchants anxious that the profitable trade with the Netherlands or Flanders should not be ruined by war with Spain.

The queen would not act on the advice of either party. She cleverly avoided a regular war with Spain while granting informal help to the Netherlanders and steadily refused either to give up Mary or to recognize her as heir. But this half and half policy displeased some of the great Roman Catholic noblemen in the north of England who broke out in rebellion (1569). The movement failed and was sternly punished, the Earl of Northumberland being justly executed. The Duke of Norfolk who planned a connected plot to bring in a Spanish army suffered the same fate. Elizabeth never again had to face open rebellion in England although her life continued to be in constant danger from secret plots. Parliament which was daily becoming more Protestant in temper, now began to act on the view that anybody openly professing the Roman Catholic religion might be fairly suspected of planning treason and passed severe laws directed against all persons who refused to conform outwardly to the official religion of the Anglican Church (1571).

Excommunication of Elizabeth, 1570—In 1570 the Pope had replied to the growing Protestant feeling in England by issuing a decree excommunicating Queen Elizabeth and declaring that her subjects were no longer bound to give her allegiance. That foolish action of the Pope like the persecutions of Mary I had an effect the opposite to that intended. It made Englishmen generally even including most of the Roman Catholics rally round their brave queen and resolve to protect her and the kingdom against foreign interference. It also forced the English Government to regard as enemies

all persons professing obedience to the Pope, and so gave a sound reason for the harsh laws against Roman Catholics, which remained in force in the United Kingdom until 1829.

Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day.—On August 24, St Bartholomew's Day, 1572, King Charles IX of France and his mother, Catharine de' Medici, earned eternal infamy by ordering a wholesale massacre of the Protestants in Paris and other places. The number of victims is variously estimated at from 20,000 to 100 000. The news aroused deep wrath in England and greatly stimulated the growth of the Protestant spirit with a corresponding hatred of the papal system which could encourage such horrors. Shameful to relate, the Pope officially approved the massacre, and struck a medal to commemorate it.

Revolt of the Netherlands.¹—About this time some of the provinces of the Low Countries or Netherlands, revolted against the Spanish tyranny and entered upon an heroic struggle, prolonged until 1609. The final success of the rebels was not formally admitted until 1648 when the Treaty of Munster affirmed their independence. Elizabeth played a tricky game, allowing a certain amount of help in men and money to reach the rebels, while carefully keeping out of a regular avowed war with Spain as long as she could. Drake and other famous seamen inflicted immenso damage on the Spanish settlements in Central and South America and acquired huge treasure in plunder. The queen, though pretending not to be at war with Spain encouraged their proceedings and knighted Drake. After 1580, when Philip annexed Portugal, the power of Spain increased, and the English Government was kept in constant anxiety owing to plots aiming at the dethronement

¹ The low lying region in the basin of the Rhine, Meuse, and Scheldt rivers, to the north of France, known collectively as the Low Countries or Netherlands, has a long history. Since 1830 it has been divided into two kingdoms—Belgium to the south and Holland to the north. The name of Holland properly belongs only to a single province. The people of the northern Netherlands (Holland) are known as the Dutch.



1. 2nd Street

MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS
From a drawing in the Bibliothèque Nationale Paris

of the queen and the succession of Mary, Queen of Scots, with Spanish help


Babington's Plot; Execution of the Queen of Scots.—While King Philip was slowly maturing plans for the invasion and conquest of England, a number of impatient Catholics, led by a gentleman named Anthony Babington, plotted the murder of Elizabeth (1586). Good reason having been shown for believing that Mary, Queen of Scots, was aware of the plot, the Council and Parliament, anxious for the safety of the kingdom, insisted on her execution. Elizabeth, after long delay, very unwillingly signed the warrant, and Mary accordingly was beheaded at Fotheringhay Castle (February 8, 1587). In England the news was received with general delight, the people feeling that a great and ever present danger had been removed. The calm dignity with which Mary met her fate has done much to excite popular sympathy in her favour, and her terrible story has always been and will continue to be the battle ground of rival writers. Whatever her faults or crimes may have been she was in her lifetime a woman of singular charm capable of inspiring intense affection and since her death her memory has been defended by her partisans with devotion equalling that of her personal attendants.

Preparation for the Armada.—After Mary's execution King Philip of Spain claimed the English crown for himself in virtue of his mother's descent from John of Gaunt,¹ and collected a powerful fleet for the invasion of the island. During 1587 Drake entered his ports and did so much damage to his shipping and stores that the invasion had to be put off until the year following.

The Rival Fleets.—At last the armed fleet, the *Invincible Armada* as the Spaniards proudly called it, set sail and was sighted off the coast of Cornwall on July 29, 1588. It consisted of about 130 ships of which 65 were of over 700 tons each, considered very large in those days, manned by at least

¹ Katharine a daughter of John of Gaunt, married a King of Castile one of the kingdoms afterwards absorbed in Spain.

8 000 sailors, and carrying about 20,000 soldiers, more than 2 000 cannons, and an ample store of provisions and ammunition for six months. The Duke of Parma lay with a large force in the Netherlands waiting to cross the North Sea under the



ELIZABETHAN MAN OF WAR

Rawlinson & MSS Bodleian

protection of the Armada. A few English vessels kept watch over him. The number of vessels in the opposing English fleet is variously stated by the authorities, but whatever the exact numbers may have been, there is no doubt that the Armada had, roughly speaking, double the tonnage, double

the number of guns and double the number of men. Only about thirty of the English ships were considerable in size. The English guns, however, had a longer range than those of the enemy and were far better served. The light English ships admirably handled by the best seamen in the world, had no difficulty in sailing round the big Spanish vessels, which were designed rather as forts from which soldiers should fight than for rapid manœuvring at sea. Elizabeth's commanders fully understood the real weakness of the imposing Armada and expected complete victory with abso-



THE ARMADA MEDAL

lute confidence. If they had been allowed they would have repeated on a larger scale Drake's feat of the year preceding and would have destroyed the Armada before it had left port.

Destruction of the Armada.—The Armada advancing in a crescent formation extending seven miles from one horn to the other, steered for Plymouth but the handy little English vessels got between the enemy and the wind hanging on the rear of the Spaniards and raking their crowded decks with well aimed broadsides¹. The invaders having lost several ships and many men were obliged to move up the Channel and take refuge in the anchorage off Calais. The English

¹ 'Broadside' means the firing of all the guns on one side of a ship at the same time. The old wooden ships carried an immense number of guns. The modern steel battleship has only a few each of enormous power.

admiral, Lord Howard of Effingham, then sent eight blazing fire-ships drifting into the crowd, and caused such terror that the Spanish captains cut their cables and taking advantage of a southerly wind, fled northwards, pursued by the English as long as was possible. All danger to the kingdom was now past. The Armada pushed on, hoping to work round by the north of Scotland and the west of Ireland, and so home. But it met such terrible storms that numbers of the ships were wrecked on the Scotch and Irish coasts, where traces of them can be discerned to this day. Any crews who landed were killed. A miserable remnant of about fifty battered ships with crews dying of disease and fatigue reached the ports of Spain. England was saved, and Queen Elizabeth gave thanks to Heaven for the deliverance, striking a medal with the Bible text inscribed, 'God blew and they were scattered.'

Alliance with France.—After the defeat of the Armada the English fleet and private adventurers continued to do much damage to the Spaniards in both Europe and America, and foiled Philip's efforts to dispatch a second Armada. In 1593 a civil war in France was ended by the acceptance as king of Henry (IV) of Navarre, who had been bred a Protestant and retained his Protestant sympathies even after he had conformed to the Romish form of worship for reasons of policy. France thus became the ally instead of the enemy of England, and Elizabeth had leisure to proceed with the conquest of Ireland.

In England the government was busily occupied with matters concerning the various religious sects, which in those days were mixed up inseparably with politics. Extreme Protestants, who began to be known as Puritans and by other names, were not liked by the queen, and suffered from harsh treatment.

Monopolies.—Elizabeth, who disliked expense, had not been obliged to call Parliament very often to obtain grants of money, and in her latter years had returned to an old evil practice of raising revenue, without parliamentary authority, by

'monopolies', that is to say, by granting to individuals or companies for heavy payments the exclusive right of trading in soap, wines, and various other articles in common use. Prices were thus raised, and the nation was grievously troubled. The queen had the wisdom to see that she must remedy the abuse, and to give way with grace, thanking the House of Commons for pointing out her error, and assuring the members that 'though you have had, and may have, many princes more mighty and wise sitting in this seat, yet you never had, or ever shall have, any that will be more careful and loving'. Her boast was just so far as England was concerned.

Death of Elizabeth.—At last, in March 1603, in the seventieth year of her age and the forty-fifth of her reign, after some weeks of distressing failure of body and mind, the great queen passed away, having intimated that she wished her cousin of Scotland to succeed her.

Ireland—We have reserved as lying apart from the narrative of English affairs the sad story of Elizabeth's rule in Ireland, the grievous blot on the glorious record of her reign. At the beginning of her father's reign the English power in the island had sunk to its lowest level, but in 1542 at the end of seven years warfare in which artillery played an important part, the whole country had acknowledged the power of the English monarch who gained some success in his attempt to make friends with the greater chiefs (*ante* p. 138). Unluckily Thomas Cromwell introduced a new and lasting cause of trouble by insisting that both England and Ireland must adopt exactly the same official form of religion and none but the authorized modes of worship. People in Ireland at that time did not object seriously to the assertion of the king's supremacy over the Church and the chiefs were more than willing to share in the plunder of the monasteries. But when Thomas Cromwell sent over a Protestant English archbishop with orders to destroy images and sacred symbols he succeeded in uniting all Ireland in opposition to England. The spirit of the Reformation had never taken hold of the people of Ireland,

where the only Protestants were English officials, or recent settlers. The opposition on religious grounds aroused by Thomas Cromwell's ill-judged measures was an important element in the resistance to Elizabeth, and affects Irish politics to this day.

The Policy of Colonization.—In the reign of Philip and Mary the policy of regular colonization had been begun, and the region known thenceforward as the King's and Queen's Counties was forcibly cleared of its native inhabitants and settled with Englishmen. The same policy was afterwards carried out on a greater scale by James I and Oliver Cromwell.

The Spaniards in Ireland.—From time to time the Spaniards tried to make Ireland the base of operations against England. A force of about 600 which landed on the coast of Kerry in 1579 was utterly destroyed, and out of 7,000 who came to support Hugh O'Neill in 1601 and occupied Kinsale and Castlehaven none escaped either capture or death.


Failure and Rebellion of Earl of Essex.—Elizabeth's special favourite, Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex, was appointed Lord Lieutenant in 1599 with the command of the largest army ever sent to Ireland up to that time, and charged to suppress the rebellion of Hugh O'Neill, head of the O'Neill clan and Earl of Tyrone.¹ He granted the chieftain extremely favourable terms, and having returned to England without leave, made a silly attempt to turn Burleigh out of office by force which deservedly cost him his head (1601).

Cruel Conquest by Lord Mountjoy.—His successor, Lord Mountjoy, a man of a different type, fought the Desmonds in the south and the O'Neills in the north for three years with savage determination, reducing Munster, the southern province, to a desert, and doing or causing deeds of horror which the pen shrinks from recording. Resistance was crushed for the moment, a great part of the land of Munster was confiscated and given to English adventurers (1603), and the colonization of

¹ Walter Devereux, Earl of Essex, father of Robert, also had commanded in Ireland and committed atrocious massacres, especially at Rathlin Island.

Ulster in 1610 under James' I was rendered possible. But the terrible methods pursued by the conquerors bore fruit in the rebellion of 1641, which had to be followed by the second merciless conquest of Oliver Cromwell, and to this day the memory of those old ill deeds is still green. Against the cruelties of Elizabeth's officers in Ireland must be set to her credit one good deed, the foundation in 1591 of Trinity College, Dublin, which became famous in later times.

Reform of the Coinage.—One of the earliest measures taken by the queen for the benefit of her English people was the



COIN OF ELIZABETH PORTCULLIS CROWN

reformation of the coinage, so fraudulently debased by her father and brother (*ante* p 143). But for Ireland coin debased still further than before was deemed to be good enough. The fact well illustrates the spirit in which the dependency was governed.

Commerce, Poor Law.—Commerce of all kinds made enormous progress during Elizabeth's reign. Her bold seamen, Sir Francis Drake, Frobisher, Hawkins and countless others, forced their way into all seas disputing with success the pretensions of the Spaniards and Portuguese to sole possession of the gold and silver of South America and the spices of India. Even the icy barriers of the Arctic Ocean did not deter the Elizabethan sailor. In 1577 Drake had sailed round the world.

and so earned his knighthood as Sir Francis. The famous East India Company received its charter on the last day of 1600, an event from which sprang the Indian Empire.¹ A vast increase of wealth and luxury, Ireland being always excepted, followed upon the extension of trade, and private houses were now built on a large scale with ample provision for comfort. The old Statutes of Labourers, with their cruel and stupid policy of mere repression, were replaced by an Act which gave the destitute poor the right to relief from the people of the locality concerned. That Act, largely modified, of course, is the foundation of the existing English Poor Law. The caste system saves India from the necessity for such costly legislation.

Merchant Shipping and the Navy.—The growth of commerce was closely connected with and largely dependent on the rapid increase in merchant shipping, which gave employment to enlarged numbers of trained seamen. The ships of the royal navy being few, many of those built for trade were used in war, and given a great share in the fighting against the Armada and on other occasions. Elizabeth did not add very many ships to her navy, and most of those built were of small size, but in 1559 and 1560 three big vessels, each of from 800 to 1,000 tons, are recorded. The queen, who was disposed to use the navy chiefly for the purpose of seizing profitable prizes, does not seem to have understood well the principles of naval warfare, which had been thoroughly mastered by Drake, Raleigh, and other officers. The skill of the Elizabethan seamen, unequalled in the world, completely outweighed the advantage enjoyed by Spain in the number and size of ships.

Outburst of Literary Genius.—The wonderful outburst of

¹ The first Englishman known to have used the Cape of Good Hope route and resided in India was the Jesuit Father John Stevens (or Stephens), who settled at Goa and resided there or at Salsette from 1579 to 1619. He was a graduate of St John's College, Oxford, and became a learned Canaresse scholar. He wrote a Christian *Purana* and other works. The reign of Akbar (1556-1605) almost coincided with that of Elizabeth (1558-1603).

literary genius in the Elizabethan Age, which must be taken to include the reign of James I so far as literature is concerned, clearly was a consequence of the events which then opened up new worlds of thought and observation, and of the gallant struggles with superior forces which brought into play the noblest qualities of human nature. The Renaissance movement (*ante*, p. 133) had stimulated the foundation of colleges and schools, and in combination with the Reformation (*ante*, p. 132) had done much to free the minds of men from the bonds imposed by ignorance, custom, and authority. The disclosure of the New World of America and of the old but unknown world of India and the Spice Islands, then made familiar to all by the tales and writings of numberless adventurers, roused the imagination of the nation and supplied a fresh field for observation, enabling authors favoured with the command of so much novel material to surpass their forerunners who had been restricted to a more limited range of ideas. All the greater works of the Elizabethan Age display the quickened imagination and wider range of thought due to the external circumstances of the time.

Beginning of the New Literature.—The new literature was not born until after the grand deliverance from the clutches of Spain had been accomplished. The appearance in 1590, two years after the Armada fight, of Edmund Spenser's *Faerie Queen*, the great allegorical poem which has inspired most of the later poets marks the source of the still flowing stream of artistic English literature. The earlier exquisite work of Chaucer in the fourteenth century (*ante*, p. 99) may be likened to a deep well of pure and sweet water from which no outflow issues. English literature between Chaucer and Spenser is almost devoid of artistic qualities.

Drama and Lyric Poetry.—The intense full life of the time needed the drama for its complete expression, no other form of composition being equal to the play for representing to both eye and ear, on the stage and in the study, all the virtues, vices, passions, and follies of men and women who drank

every drop of the cup of life. It is needless to dwell on the supreme merits of the best of Shakespeare's plays. Nobody else comes very near him, but Marlowe, Fletcher, Ben Jonson, and others have much noble work to their credit. The lyric poetry of the age is full of sweetness and grace.

Artistic Prose.—While poets raised English literature to the highest imaginable point, the art of writing musical, readable prose also came into being. The English Bible, Bacon's *Essays*, and Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity* are still acknowledged masterpieces in their several styles¹. The enlarged scope of the exact sciences as dealt with in the treatises of Kepler, Galileo, and other 'masters of those who know', combined with all the other influences of the time to expand men's thoughts and fire their imagination. The use of Latin as the universal language of scientific treatises in all the countries of Europe placed the researches of every discoverer and philosopher at the disposal of all persons interested. Science recognized no frontiers.

Character of Queen Elizabeth.—Queen Elizabeth during whose long reign so many memorable things happened and so many great men made their mark on the world, had a complex character not easy to comprehend. Even when we honestly try to judge her by the standards of her times, and not by those of ours, many features are repellent. Her personal vanity, love of finery, greed for flattery, and coarseness in language and behaviour are weaknesses lying plain on the surface. She often displayed the arrogance of her father and the levity of her mother. Her tricky policy, apparent hesitations, and seeming unsteadiness of purpose drove ministers and ambassadors nearly mad; but they had the merit of success, and it would be rash to affirm that she would have done better for her country had she followed the straight Protestant counsels of Burleigh or the straight

¹ The so-called 'authorized version' of the Bible (1611) is in large part based on earlier translations by Coverdale and Tyndale. The style, consequently, is not exactly that of the Elizabethan Age.

Catholic counsels of Norfolk. If she was stingy in supplying the wants of the brave men who so gladly shed their blood in her service she left the unspent money with her faithful subjects and made them rich. If in Ireland she was cruel and knew not how to win the loyalty of its people other English rulers before and after her have been equally cruel and equally blind.

When all has been said that can be said against her she stands out as one of the greatest sovereigns in history and must be adjudged to have well deserved her popular title of 'Good Queen Bess'. 'Nothing', she said, 'nothing is so dear to me as the love and good will of my people'. She was a 'lone woman' called to do the work of a man and to fight from the age of twenty five to seventy for life and country against the mightiest kings and the subtlest intriguers of the world, with unflinching courage and unswerving faith in the lofty destiny of the people whom she loved and who loved her.¹

LEADING DATES

Accession of Elizabeth	Nov 17 1558
Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity	1559
French expelled from Scotland	1560
Mary in Scotland	1561-8
Rebellion of Earl of Northumberland	1569
Excommunication of Elizabeth	1570
Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day	1572
Voyage of Drake round the world	1577-80
Babington's plot	1586
Execution of Mary Queen of Scots	1587
Defeat of the Armada	1588
Publication of the <i>Faerie Queene</i>	1590
Publication of Bacon's <i>Essays</i>	1597
Conquest of Ireland by Lord Mountjoy	1600-3
Charter of East India Company	Dec 31 1600
Execution of Earl of Essex	1601
Death of Elizabeth	March 23 1603

¹ The student who desires to understand the Elizabethan Age more fully cannot do better than study the account of it in Green's *Short History of the English People*.

CHAPTER XVI

THE STUART DYNASTY, JAMES I AND CHARLES I, TO THE
OUTBREAK OF THE CIVIL WAR, 1603-42

Accession of James VI of Scotland, I of England —Under the will of Henry VIII, which had been accepted as regulating the succession of his daughters Mary and Elizabeth, the successor to the latter should have been Sir William Seymour (Earl of Hertford), the senior descendant of Henry's younger sister Mary. But he never made a claim nor were his rights apparently ever advocated by anybody¹. It was understood that Queen Elizabeth wished that her cousin James VI of Scotland, son of Mary Queen of Scots and grandson of Margaret, the elder sister of Henry VIII, should succeed to the throne of England. His claim, supported by Sir Robert Cecil, son of Lord Burleigh, met with no open opposition. Accordingly, James, who was then thirty six years of age, hastened from Edinburgh to London and was proclaimed king with general assent. He was duly crowned in July as James I of England.

Arabella Stuart —Shortly after his accession a plot called the 'Main', was detected which aimed at calling to the throne the king's unmarried cousin, Arabella Stuart, also a descendant of Margaret, elder sister of Henry VIII. Sir Walter Raleigh, one of the most brilliant of Elizabeth's courtiers, distinguished as soldier, sailor, explorer, and author, was convicted, rightly or wrongly, of concern in the plot, and was imprisoned in the Tower, where he remained for many years. Arabella Stuart, who never did anything to prosecute the claim put forward in her name by other people, continued to live at court until 1610, when she was privately married to Sir William Seymour, the other possible candidate for the throne. That step caused her imprisonment in the

¹ Doubts were cast upon the legitimacy of Sir William because his parents had been married privately.

Tower, where she died out of her mind. The title of the Scotch Stuart family to the English crown was thus finally cleared.

Failure of Attempted Union of England and Scotland.—James would have liked to bring about the closer union of the two kingdoms, such as was effected a century later (1707), but was unable to overcome the opposition of various interests. He succeeded only in procuring a judicial decision that his Scottish subjects born after his accession to the English throne should not be regarded in England as aliens or foreigners. In all other respects England and Scotland continued to occupy the relation one to the other of foreign states, in spite of the fact that both were under the rule of one king. In relation to other countries the two kingdoms, of course, formed a single state, the Kingdom of Great Britain.

The Gunpowder Plot, 1605—The king also wished to relax the laws requiring Roman Catholics to go to the Anglican churches, and everybody to say their prayers in the same fashion, but his Parliament, largely Puritan in sentiment, was averse to such concessions and compelled the government to go on levying fines from people who failed to attend the official church services. This state of things was resented by a group of Roman Catholic gentlemen. Mr Robert Catesby and others, who formed a plot for blowing up with gunpowder the king and members of Parliament on November 5, 1605. The conspiracy was detected just in time and Guy Fawkes, the man appointed to fire the powder, was caught in a chamber under the Parliament house. Most of the persons concerned were captured and executed.¹

James's Theory of Divine Right.—James, who was a learned man, deeply read in old theological books, came to England firmly convinced that both kings and bishops were entitled to rule other people by 'divine right', that is to say, that they were appointed by God as governors and could not be

¹ The attempt of Father Gerard to discredit the received account of the plot has been refuted by Dr S. R. Gardiner in a special treatise *What Gunpowder Plot Was* (1897).

opposed without sin. He was as keen to support the authority of bishops as that of kings, condensing his theory in the maxim, 'No bishop no king.' He was bold enough to declare officially that 'as it is atheism and blasphemy to dispute what God can do, so it is presumption and high contempt in a subject to dispute what a king can do, or to say that a king cannot do this or that.' Courtly flatterers maintained that 'the king is above the law by his absolute power' and at liberty to alter or suspend any particular law considered by him to be injurious. Such sentiments however proper for Turkey, were strange to Englishmen whose fathers had so often won precious liberties by resisting and even deposing kings. James consequently could never work in harmony with Parliament, which he constantly offended by his presumptuous arrogance.

His Relations with Parliament—The king who refused to accept the principles laid down in Magna Carta and many later statutes continually strove to assert claims to tax the people without consent of Parliament and to inflict punishments at the discretion of judges wholly under his personal control. His first Parliament (1604–11) was largely occupied in resisting the levy of customs duties merely by royal authority and the vexatious revival of nearly obsolete feudal dues. His second Parliament (1614) was called the 'Addled Parliament' because it did no business the king having dissolved it suddenly rather than listen to its remonstrances. Seven years of arbitrary misgovernment without summoning a Parliament then followed. In 1621 the king's urgent need of money forced him to summon the Houses, and again in 1624 he was obliged to ask their aid. Those two Parliaments did much to maintain English liberty and to prepare the way for the decisive struggle of the next reign.

Difference between the Tudor and Stuart Despotisms—The chief interest of the inglorious and discreditable rule of James is to be found in watching his struggles to exalt the royal authority even beyond the height attained by the Tudors,

who, when they claimed 'absolute power', meant authority free from bondage to any foreigner at Rome or elsewhere, but not freedom from English law and custom. Neither Henry VIII nor his children ever attempted to deny in theory the principles of English liberty. They were content, as a rule, to exercise practically despotic power under the forms of law. While they felt no hesitation about creating 'rotten boroughs' or controlling the election of members, they professed to take the advice of Parliament and to respect its authority. While interfering freely with the course of justice by terrorizing judges, witnesses, and juries, they made use of the regular legal machinery. The trial even of Anne Boleyn was conducted with a certain amount of decent regard for the forms of law, although every care was taken that there should be no doubt as to the result. Thomas Cromwell felt no scruple about hanging the Abbot of Reading for opposition to the king's supremacy and the dissolution of the monasteries, but the entry of his intention in his notebook took the form of '*Item, the Abbot of Reading to be tried and executed at Reading*'. The trial, although purely a matter of form, was an indispensable preliminary.

James I, a foreigner devoid of respect for English traditions, went further, maintaining that a king was not bound by any law save the guidance of his conscience, and claiming to exercise authority as absolute and arbitrary as that of Chinghiz Khan or Jahangir. Such a claim could not possibly be accepted by the English nation, nor did either James or his son possess the exceptional personal qualities needed to give a plausible appearance to demands so outrageous. The penalty for making them, deferred until the reign of Charles, had then to be paid.

Having thus indicated the nature of the relations of James with his people and the significance of his reign we proceed to notice in convenient order the principal remaining events of his time.

The Year 1612 a Turning point.—The year 1612 marks

a turning-point in the rule of James, so far as English affairs were concerned. Up to that date the king had been kept in check to a certain extent by his cautious, experienced minister, Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury, the second son of Lord Burleigh, whom he resembled in character. But the death of Cecil in that year threw James for the rest of his reign into the hands of ignorant favourites, who mismanaged the internal affairs of the kingdom and brought the name of England to contempt abroad. The death in the same year of Henry, Prince of Wales, a promising young man, eighteen years of age, made his less worthy brother Charles heir to the throne.

Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset.—The first of the two royal favourites, whose influence caused so much scandal, was Robert Carr (or Ker), a good-looking Scotch youth, who had begun his service at court as a page. In 1611 he was created Viscount Rochester, and, in spite of his absolute ignorance of business, was admitted to the Privy Council and treated by the king as his confidential adviser. Two years later James disgraced himself by arranging a marriage between Carr and the divorced Countess of Essex, a woman of depraved character, raising the favourite at the same time to the dignity of Earl of Somerset. In 1616 both the Countess and Somerset were convicted of the murder of Sir Thomas Overbury by poison, and sent into obscurity, their lives being spared by the favour of James.

Somerset's Vicious Government.—During his term of power the influence of Somerset was wholly mischievous. The Government was grossly extravagant and could not make both ends meet even by levying illegal customs, selling honours, and other disreputable devices. The 'Addled Parliament' of 1614 already mentioned could do nothing, because the king dissolved it the moment it sought to redress public grievances.


George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham.—When the Overbury case (1615-16) ruined Somerset, James had already begun his seven years' experiment of governing without the aid of Parliament. The disgraced favourite was replaced by George

Villiers, a handsome young Englishman of good family, who soon acquired influence even greater than that wielded by Somerset. The royal favour rapidly advanced the youth through the grades of the peerage, until he became Duke of Buckingham, and probably the richest man in England. The duke, who had not capacity for the greatness thrust upon him, mismanaged equally home and foreign affairs. He contrived, however, to retain his influence over both James and Charles, and continued in power until his death in 1628.

Intrigues for a Spanish Marriage.—A foolish intrigue to secure a marriage between Prince Charles and a Spanish princess, an arrangement altogether opposed to English opinion and interests, came to nothing in 1618, because James was not able to guarantee full religious liberty to the Roman Catholics in his dominions. The intrigue was renewed in 1623. Its final failure in that year gave the Prince of Wales *popularity for a time the English people being delighted to know that there would not be a second Spanish marriage*. Their experience of Philip and Mary had been enough.

Execution of Sir Walter Raleigh—The King's desire to win the favour of Spain led to one of the most disgraceful acts of the reign—the execution of Sir Walter Raleigh (1618). Shortly after the accession of James, Raleigh was accused, as already mentioned (*ante*, p. 167) of concern in a plot and had been imprisoned ever since. In 1617 he obtained his liberty in order to search for certain supposed gold mines in Guiana at the mouths of the Orinoco river in South America, binding himself not to interfere with the Spanish colonies. The expedition failed to find the gold mines and became involved in a fight with the Spaniards. When Raleigh came home James caused him to be beheaded on the treason charge fifteen years old, simply to please the King of Spain.

Virginia, Potatoes and Tobacco—In Queen Elizabeth's time Sir Walter Raleigh had founded a colony in North America, which he named Virginia in honour of the Virgin Queen. After much suffering and temporary failure the



SIR WALTER RALEIGH

colony grew into a prosperous community, which is now one of the States of the United States. Raleigh brought home from America potatoes and tobacco, previously unknown in Europe. From Europe traders introduced both crops into India, where they are now largely cultivated and freely consumed. Mohammedan historians tell how Akbar wanted to smoke tobacco but was dissuaded by the mullahs, who denounced the drug as an unwholesome and dangerous novelty. No species of tobacco seems to be native to India.¹

The 'Pilgrim Fathers', 1620.—The attempt of the English Government to enforce on everybody strict uniformity of religious worship according to the rules of the Anglican or English Church, by that time quite separate from the Roman, was so galling to the Puritans, especially those of the Calvinist school (*ante*, p. 134), that many of them emigrated to the new settlements in America where they could worship God in their own fashion. The emigrants, about a hundred in number who sailed in 1620 on board of a small ship called the *Mayflower* founded the colonies afterwards known as New England, comprising Boston and many other places now famous. Their descendants speak of them with reverence as the Pilgrim Fathers.

East Indian Trade; Sir Thomas Roe.—Although James himself did not do much to develop the new trade with India he did something, and his subjects on their own account did much. The 'factory', or commercial settlement at Surat on the Bombay coast obtained a *farman*, or official permit from Jahāngir Padshah of Hindustan, in 1612, and in 1615 James sent to that monarch a formal embassy headed by Sir Thomas Roe, who spent three years in India. Sir Thomas, an able man, was not granted the treaty for which he asked, but, nevertheless, was of considerable help to his countrymen. He wrote an excellent account of his mission, which is one of the leading authorities for the history of Jahāngir. In 1622

¹ The question is disputed, and it appears to be the fact that some drug was smoked in India before Akbar's time. But it cannot have been tobacco.

the English of Surat captured Ormuz in the Persian Gulf from the Portuguese, although England and Portugal were then officially at peace. In those days the adventurers of all nations in the East played their own game without regard to European politics. An English attempt to secure a share of the spice trade of the Molucca Islands to the east of Borneo then held by the Dutch was frustrated by the 'Massacre of Amboyna' (1623). The Dutch, having seized the English traders and some Japanese who were with them, put them to death with torture. James refused to take any action, and no redress was obtained until 1654, when Oliver Cromwell forced the Dutch to pay an indemnity.

The Thirty Years' War.—Germany was desolated for thirty years (1618–48) by a ferocious struggle, known as the Thirty Years' War, waged between the Roman Catholic princes on the one side, and the Protestant princes on the other. It ended in the distinct separation of the northern Protestant from the southern Roman Catholic states, as existing to this day. In the early stages of the conflict England was specially interested because Elizabeth, the daughter of James, was married to a Protestant German prince, Frederick, the Elector Palatine¹. The English people were eager to give Frederick effective help, but James and Buckingham, who could never make up their minds to do anything sensible or decisive, allowed him to be driven out of his dominions (1622). An expedition tardily sent out in 1624 to march through the Netherlands to the Elector's help was utterly mismanaged, and lost three-fourths of its strength in a few weeks.

Parliament of 1621; Monopolies.—As noted above (*ante*, p. 169), the third Parliament of James met in 1621. The king wanted money, the Parliament, after seven years of arbitrary and illegal misgovernment, wanted reform. When the abuses

¹ Seven princes (including three bishops) were the persons entitled to elect the Germanic emperor, who claimed to be the successor of the Caesars. One of the seven was the Count Palatine of a territory on the Rhine who was Steward of the Empire. He was known as the Elector Palatine.

of the administration were attacked James lost his temper and dissolved the Parliament before it had granted him any supplies. But the session was not without fruit James, who had revived the odious system of monopolies, given up by Elizabeth (*ante*, p 160), had permitted the most annoying oppression by the persons who had bought the rights of exclusive trading Parliament succeeded in driving Sir Giles Mompesson, the worst of the monopolists, out of the kingdom, and in punishing others

Condemnation of Lord Bacon.—The inquiry into monopolies led to examination of the proceedings in the courts of justice, and especially the Court of Chancery, presided over by the Viscount of St Albans, Francis Bacon, commonly called Lord Bacon and famous throughout the world as an author and philosopher The proofs that Bacon as Lord Chancellor had taken bribes were too clear to be resisted He pleaded guilty, was removed from office, heavily fined, and sentenced to imprisonment Although most of the penalties were remitted, the conviction of the Lord Chancellor, a stout supporter of the king's theories of absolute government, was a notable victory for the House of Commons The prosecution had excellent effects in teaching judges to be upright, but many years were to elapse before judges in England attained the high standard of honesty now expected as a matter of course In India a similar improvement in the uprightness of native Indian judicial officers has made rapid progress during the past century, and will no doubt, continue Bacon, pre-eminent in intellect, was deficient in moral strength, and it is impossible to deny the justice of Macaulay's judgement that we are 'compelled to regard his character with mingled contempt and admiration, with mingled aversion and gratitude'.¹



FRANCIS BACON

From the portrait in the National Portrait Gallery

Parliament of 1624; the Elector Palatine—The last Parliament of the reign, which met in 1624, was zealous to help the Elector Palatine as the champion of the Protestant cause, and willing to vote large grants for the war. But the House of Commons with good reason was so distrustful of the king that it would not let him handle the money, which was directed to be made over to treasurers appointed by the House, and to be spent on certain specified objects. The attempt to help the Elector, as we have seen (*ante*, p. 175), was a failure.

French Treaty of Marriage.—During the same year (1624) a treaty of marriage between Prince Charles and Henrietta Maria, sister of the French king, was concluded. The Prince gave promises of religious freedom to the Roman Catholics of England which could not be fulfilled by him and were opposed to his engagements made with Parliament. The marriage produced evil effects in the next reign.

Colonization or 'Plantation' of Ulster.—The ruthless measures taken by Mountjoy (*ante*, p. 161) having made resistance hopeless for the moment, the chiefs of the O Neills and the O Donnells, whom the English called the Earls of Tyrone and Tyrconnell retired to Spain in 1607. This incident is known to Irish historians as the Flight of the Earls. The Government of King James, like that of his predecessors, ignoring the Irish laws under which the land occupied by a sept or clan was the joint property of all the members, assumed that the feudal law prevailed, and treated the O Neill and O Donnell lands as the forfeited property of the exiled chiefs. Territory in the northern province of Ulster, now forming six counties, was confiscated and mostly distributed to English and Scotch settlers by a commission operating on a systematic plan (1608–11).¹ Only the small area of 70 000 acres was left to

influence all over Europe. He rejected mere authority in matters of science, and called on men to study nature and to reason by induction from particular instances to general propositions.

¹ The six counties formed are (1) Tyrone (2) Coleraine now Londonderry, (3) Donegal (4) Fermanagh, (5) Cavan and (6) Armagh. The ruined town



James I



Charles I



Oliver Cromwell



Charles II

the natives This sweeping and unjust measure, although of benefit to Ireland by reason of the introduction of a business-like, industrious Protestant population, produced evils which have more than balanced the gains It permanently divided Ireland into two hostile sections with divergent aims and ideals, and left behind it a legacy of hate

Death and Character of James I.—Early in 1625 (March 27) James died of a fever at the age of fifty-eight, after a reign of twenty-two years His contemporary, King Henry IV of France, summed him up in a neat description as ‘the wisest fool in Christendom’, which, being interpreted, means that he had considerable brains, and much learning, especially in theology, but little practical sense He was the slave of his theories, which he tried to carry out to their logical conclusion without taking the actual facts into account Brought up in unruly Scotland where he had to struggle for existence, fighting in turn with turbulent nobles and fanatical Puritan clergy, he was utterly out of touch with English sentiment and wholly indifferent to the traditions of the English constitution Consequently, he could never keep on good terms with his Parliaments, or secure the hearty goodwill of the nation His scandalous partiality for Carr and Villiers, degrading to him and his administration, was the cause of gross misgovernment His management of foreign affairs was as silly as his attempt to rule Englishmen on Asiatic principles His person was ridiculous, and he was an arrant coward Nevertheless, he succeeded in founding a school of thought which adopted his theories concerning the divine right of kings, and exercised much influence on the controversies of later generations The University of Oxford, especially, became the chosen home of teachers who cared much for the rights of bishops and kings but little for the liberties of England

Accession and Early Years of Charles I.—The Prince of Wales on his accession in March 1625, under the style of of Derry was rebuilt by London merchants, and so became known as London-derry



CHARLES I

From the portrait by Daniel Mytens in the National Portrait Gallery

Charles I. inherited from his father the war with Spain, the Duke of Buckingham, and the most extreme theory of the divine right of kings. During the first three years of his reign (March 1625 to March 1628) three Parliaments, summoned to grant the funds necessary for the Government, were all dissolved because they could not agree with the king, who persisted in continuing the arbitrary procedure of James.

An expedition sent to take the Spanish port of Cadiz did nothing to the purpose (1625). In the next year the English Government quarrelled with France, with the result that in 1627 a French war was added to the Spanish. The town of La Rochelle, on the Bay of Biscay, occupied by French Protestants called Huguenots, was then making a heroic defence against the forces of the French King, Louis XIII, whose minister was the famous Cardinal Richelieu. Buckingham in person attempted to relieve the town by landing on the island of Ré (Rhe), but was driven off with the loss of more than half of his army. Nothing else of importance happened in the wars with France and Spain, which were brought to an end in 1629 and 1630. The ill-success of the English operations was largely due to the king's failure to obtain supplies from parliamentary grants, the sums which he scraped together in irregular ways being inadequate. Moreover, Buckingham was so detested that nobody would serve under his orders with zeal. In August 1628 he was murdered by an aggrieved officer.

Petition of Right, 1628.—The most important of the three Parliaments in the beginning of the reign was that of 1628, which compelled the king to accept the Petition of Right, affirming English liberties as so often claimed in Magna Carta and other solemn documents and so often violated by tyrannical kings. The four promises exacted from Charles were (1) that he should not levy any gift, loan, benevolence, or tax, save by Act of Parliament, (2) that he would not imprison any man except on a definite charge and according to law; (3) that soldiers and sailors should not be billeted or lodged

compulsorily, in private houses ; and (4) that commissions for trials by martial law in time of peace should not be issued. The student must remember that at that time no standing or permanent army existed, and the distinction between the royal navy and the merchant service had not been completely effected. Charles reluctantly made the promises required, but without any intention of keeping them. All through his career he proved himself to be a faithless man on whose word no reliance could be placed. It would have been better for him if he had adopted as his guide the motto of Edward I, 'Keep troth' (*Pactum serva, ante*, p. 91).

Charles contended that the terms of the Petition of Right did not bar him from collecting the customs dues called 'tonnage and poundage' without the sanction of the House of Commons, but the House would not accept that view. Parliament, strongly Puritan in temper, also disagreed with the king's policy in Church matters.

Personal Government, 1629-40.—Ultimately, in March 1629, after a stormy scene, Parliament was dissolved, not to meet again for eleven years. Sir John Eliot, the leader of the opposition to the Crown, was imprisoned in the Tower, where he died. Charles now resolved to renew his father's experiment of trying to govern without the help of Parliament, and found a willing instrument of his policy in Sir Thomas Wentworth, better known as the Earl of Strafford, who had begun his political career as an opponent of the Court and the colleague of Sir John Eliot, but now changed sides, and essayed to play a part similar to that of Thomas Cromwell, Earl of Essex, in the time of Henry VIII. His open appearance, however, in that character came later, in 1639.

For some years Charles was his own minister, although he was dependent on the cleverness of Weston (Earl of Portland), his treasurer, for the means to pay his way without parliamentary supplies. The old abuses were shamelessly revived, including the sale of monopolies (*ante*, pp. 159), the enforcement of oppressive forest regulations, and the exaction of

obsolete feudal dues The Court of Star Chamber, established by Henry VII (*ante*, p 127), enforced the arbitrary action of the Government by severe sentences on all who resisted the royal tyranny

Ship money; John Hampden —During the years 1634–8 the controversy concerning the king's claim to raise revenue without the authority of Parliament was brought to an issue by the celebrated 'ship money' case Charles rightly judged that England should possess a permanent royal navy strong enough to keep in check the powerful fleets then at the command of France and the Netherlands The Spanish naval power, which had never recovered after the destruction of the Armada, was no longer to be feared In 1634 a writ was issued calling on the coast towns London included, to pay ship-money for the building of a fleet, and after some grumbling the orders were generally complied with But in the years following 1636 1637 and 1639, when the demand was repeated and extended to the inland towns and counties, much opposition was aroused Mr John Hampden, a rich land owner in Buckinghamshire, disputed the assessment made on his property in 1637 In the next year the case was heard by twelve judges, seven of whom decided in favour of the Crown The courage shown by Hampden in fighting the test case attracted general admiration and pointed him out as the most fitting leader of the Commons in the coming struggle

Wentworth in Ireland —Wentworth (*ante*, p 183), who had been appointed Lord Deputy of Ireland in 1632, gave that unfortunate country the best English government that it had ever had till then although he was not able to free his mind from the erroneous ideas of his time He attempted the colonization or 'plantation' of Connaught the western province after the fashion of Elizabeth, Mary, and James I, but could not induce many settlers to venture into those wild lands He was more successful in forcing everybody, high and low, to keep the peace and conferred on Ulster a boon

of permanent value by encouraging the cultivation of flax and the manufacture of linen—industries which still flourish in the north. While doing his best to govern the island justly according to his lights, Wentworth cherished a deep project for using the well-drilled army created by him in Ireland as the instrument to secure his master's absolute power in Great Britain.

Strafford's Government; First Bishops' War.—In 1639, Wentworth returned to England, was created Earl of Strafford, and became until his death the king's chief counsellor, acting in concert with Archbishop Laud. Meantime Charles had got into trouble with his Scotch subjects by trying to impose on them against their will the English system of Church government and worship. The Scots, who mostly favoured the variety of Christian doctrine taught by Calvin (*ante*, p. 134), liked to manage their religious affairs directly by assemblies or synods elected by the ministers and congregations in the fashion called Presbyterian, without the help of bishops. Charles, remembering his father's maxim, 'No bishop, no king,' insisted that they must accept bishops and conform to the English modes of public worship. In 1638 the Scots held a General Assembly which refused to obey the royal orders and resolved to maintain the Presbyterian system. Charles then proceeded to apply force, and collected a small army, but not having money enough to pay the men, was compelled to come to terms at Berwick. This abortive expedition is called the First Bishops' War (1639), because the king intended to fight on behalf of the bishops.

The 'Short Parliament'; Second Bishops' War.—When Wentworth became minister he saw that it was impossible to go on without parliamentary grants of money, and advised Charles to summon a Parliament. It met in 1640, but sat for three weeks only, because the king dissolved it when he could not induce the members to accept his policy. With his usual obstinacy he persisted in attempting another attack on the Scots, and again collected a force. But, for the same

reasons as before, this expedition, the so-called Second Bishops' War (1640) came to nought, and the king, much against his will, was obliged to summon Parliament once more.

Meeting of the Long Parliament ; Execution of Strafford.—The new Parliament, famous as the Long Parliament, met in November, 1640, and at once impeached Strafford, and passed a Bill making it compulsory for Parliament to meet every three years even if not summoned (Triennial Bill). Under the leadership of John Pym, a strong Presbyterian, the impeachment of Strafford was proceeded with, that is to say, he was accused by the Commons and put on trial before the Lords. But difficulties being found in proving a formal charge of treason the Commons changed the process, and brought in a Bill of Attainder. A foolish attempt of the king—who was always ill advised by his French queen—to seize the Tower of London, so frightened the House of Lords that it passed the Bill¹. Charles, who had solemnly promised his devoted minister that not a hair of his head should be touched, was base enough to give his assent to the Bill. Strafford accordingly was executed on May 12. In December 1640 the Commons had presented to the king the Grand Remonstrance—a huge document of 206 clauses setting forth the grievances of the nation and the remedies proposed. The king made a reply. The discussion gave rise to the distinct Royalist party.

Abolition of Abuses.—Parliament then proceeded (1641) to abolish the Courts of High Commission (*ante*, p. 151) and Star Chamber (*ante*, p. 127), and to put a stop to all the illegal and high handed procedure of Tudor and Stuart times. If Charles had honestly accepted the situation thus created

¹ A Bill, when passed by both Houses of Parliament and assented to by the king becomes an Act. A Bill of Attainder passed through exactly the same stages as any other Bill. Its effect was to *attaint* the person aimed at, that is to say, to authorize his execution, deprive him of all civil rights and forfeit his property. He might or might not be heard in his defence. The process was used for the last time in 1697 against Sir John Fenwick, and was abolished in Queen Victoria's reign.

and had been willing to act as a constitutional monarch, willing to respect the liberties of the people and the authority of Parliament, all might have been well. But he always dreamt of overthrowing Parliament by force, and cherished hopes that he might find in Scotland the means of doing so, by giving way to the wishes of the Scots in Church matters.

Irish Rebellion, 1641.—During the same eventful year, 1641, a terrible rebellion broke out in Ireland, beginning on October 22 in Ulster and gradually spreading over the whole island. At first the rising was confined to the native Irish, who sought to win back the lands taken from them by the 'plantation' or confiscation policy, but after a short time the Anglo Irish Catholic lords joined the rebels. Awful atrocities were committed by the insurgents, and many thousands of the Protestant English settlers, including women and children, were either killed outright or destroyed by want and cold. It was evident that the rebellion could be crushed only by sending a large force from England, but the House of Commons was so much occupied with other matters, and so unwilling to trust the king with men and money which might be used to attack English liberties as planned by Strafford that few troops were sent and the disturbances were allowed to continue for years. The Commons, more interested in the quarrel with the king and Church, proceeded to impeach twelve bishops.

Attempted Arrest of the Five Members—Charles, acting rashly on the advice of his French queen, who did not rightly understand English affairs, decided to retort by going down in person to the House of Commons in order to arrest five members of the House who had opposed his policy, and were accused of treasonable correspondence with the Scots. When he arrived, the 'birds had flown', as he remarked with annoyance so that his intended stroke failed. A few days later the members were brought back to the House in triumph.

Civil War.—Parliament now demanded the control of the militia, or trained bands (commonly called 'train bands')—

a force of about 160,000 men, which had been reorganized by James I, and was descended from the ancient Saxon *fyrð*, or shire levies (*ante*, p 63) That demand could not possibly be accepted by the king and it was now clear that the issue between him and Parliament must be decided by arms Both sides began to collect troops The Parliament men assembled at Northampton under the command of Lord Essex Charles raised the Royal Standard at Nottingham on August 22, 1642, and the Civil War began It lasted for nine years, until September 3, 1651, when Oliver Cromwell's 'crowning mercy' of Worcester stopped the fighting

Religion and Politics.—In order not to interrupt the story of political events, little has been said about the conflict on Church affairs in England, but the student, however faint may be his personal interest in such matters must try to realize clearly that the struggle between Charles and Parliament was due to differences in religion even more than to the resistance of the people against royal despotism in relation to life, liberty, and property At that time the principles of the Reformation especially in their Calvinist form, had gripped the hearts of the English people, most of whom were ardent Protestants hating and dreading all teaching or ceremonies tending to recall the errors and practice of the foreign Church of Rome

The War of the Sects —The question of the supremacy of the Crown over the Anglican Church as against that of the Pope was no longer of interest, that issue having been settled in favour of the English view The small and weak minority who still held by the Romanist creed and worship had little influence and could hardly obtain leave to live But, as between different shades of Protestant opinion, disputes raged hotly and the press poured forth a torrent of pamphlets The party in the English Church which liked the government of the Church by bishops and loved forms of worship with a good deal of ceremony, joined usually with the Catholics in supporting the king, the ally of the bishops The other

Protestants described in general terms as Puritans who hated bishops disliked all ceremony in worship and favoured a severe mode of life with little amusement generally took the side of the Parliament. Thus religious disputes were mixed up inseparably with political differences. Divergence of opinion on religious questions was made more bitter by the opposition of the king to the Parliament on matters of taxation and so forth while the party divisions of politicians were inflamed by the heat of sectarian hatred so that Englishmen were ready to shed each other's blood in battle.

Archbishop Laud—Charles like his father believed firmly that Church affairs could not be managed properly except by bishops. We have seen how that creed brought him into trouble in Scotland. Many people in England who had no objection to bishops disliked that their authority should be pressed too far. William Laud an eminent Oxford divine who became Archbishop of Canterbury in 1633 stretched the power of the bishops to its extreme limit and caused deep discontent by the use which he made of the Courts of Star Chamber and the High Commission to enforce his policy of compelling everybody to worship God in the same fashion. Cruel sentences were passed on people who refused to conform or who opposed the archbishop by their writings. His proceedings had a large share in provoking the Civil War which like the Thirty Years War in Germany (*ante p 175*) then drawing to a close was more a conflict between opposed religious ideals than between royal despotism and popular freedom in the affairs of daily life.

LEADING DATES

Accession of James I (VI of Scotland)	1603
The Main Plot conviction of Sir W. Raleigh	1603
First Parliament	1604-11
Gunpowder Plot	1605
Plantation of Ulster	1608-11
Death of Salisbury and Prince Henry, rise of Carr	1612
Second (Addled) Parliament	1614

Fall of Carr; rise of Villiers, embassy of Sir T. Roe	. 1615
Thirty Years' War in Germany	1618-48
The 'Pilgrim Fathers'	1620
Third Parliament; condemnation of Bacon	1621
Fourth Parliament, French marriage treaty	1624
Accession of Charles I, Cadiz expedition	1625
Petition of Right	1628
Personal government	1629-40
Ship-money decision	1633
The 'Bishops' Wars'	1639, 1640
The 'Short Parliament'	1640
Meeting of 'Long Parliament', execution of Strafford	1640
Irish Rebellion	1641
Outbreak of Civil War	Aug 22, 1642

CHAPTER XVII

THE CIVIL WAR, THE COMMONWEALTH AND THE PROTECTORATE, 1642-60

Relative Strength of the Combatants.—At the moment when both parties to the quarrel decided that the questions at issue could not be settled without fighting, the material advantages lay with the Parliament, which received the support of the navy and principal ports and controlled London and the south-east, then the most populous, wealthy, and advanced section of the country. The numbers of soldiers assembled at Northampton under the command of Lord Essex were much greater than those gathered round the royal standard at Nottingham. But, as some compensation, the king was stronger in cavalry, an arm of great importance in those days. The royal horse was commanded by Prince Rupert, son of the Elector Palatine and the king's sister, (*ante*, p. 175) a bold, dashing leader of a charge, but wanting in the cool judgement needed by a good general.

Battle of Edgehill.—The first fight took place at Edgehill in Warwickshire (October 23, 1642), and, although not very decisive, opened up the king's road to Oxford, which became his head-quarters. The royal army was not strong enough to

attack and secure London which the king had hoped to take by directing three armies on the city. His plans were foiled by the opposition of the ports of Hull and Plymouth and the army of the Eastern Association in Cambridge and the neighbouring counties. Both sides in the early stages of the war had to work with almost untrained men who were extremely unwilling to leave the county to which they belonged and it was consequently impossible for the commanders on either side to carry out regularly planned campaigns for distant objects such as may be executed with a professional army. So Charles had to be content to leave London in the hands of his opponents a crushing disadvantage to him throughout the war.



COIN OF CHARLES I
NEWARK SIEGE PIECE

Events of 1643 — During 1643 when the king's forces had increased and comprised three considerable distinct armies his position improved and if he could have taken London in that year he would have won. The great western city of Bristol came into his hands in July but Gloucester although besieged in force held out for the Parliament. The deaths of Hampden who fell in a skirmish in June and of John Pym who passed away six months later were severe blows to the Puritans. On the other side the loss of Lord Falkland in September was much felt by the king.

Scotch Invasion, Battle of Marston Moor — The situation of the contending parties was materially changed in January, 1644 when 21 000 Scots entered England to help the Parliament which had agreed to accept the Presbyterian form of Church government as practised in the northern kingdom. Later in the year the royal commanders the Marquess of Newcastle and Prince Rupert lost almost their whole army in a bloody battle fought against the Scots and their English

allies at Marston Moor, a few miles from York (July 2, 1644), which gave the north of England to the Parliament. Oliver Cromwell first came into prominent notice as a cavalry leader in that battle, which was decided by a wheeling movement of his command, much resembling that practised by Alexander against Porus.

The Independents—If the Parliamentary forces had struck hard at that moment the war might have been brought to an early end, but Lord Manchester, then in chief command, did not wish to drive the king to extremity. The stress of conflict had brought two parties among the Parliament men into sharp opposition. Most of the members of the House of Commons, as well as the few lords on that side, including Manchester, favoured the Presbyterian Church system, and desired to come to terms with the king, while the bolder spirits of the army, largely inspired by Cromwell, disliked Presbyterian methods and called themselves Independents, as wishing to see each congregation of worshippers independent and free from the control of either bishop or synod. The Independents wanted to fight to a finish and force the king to his knees, mainly in order to secure liberty of worship. Many of them also inclined to a republican form of government and did not care to have a king at all, but they were chiefly concerned with Church questions. We moderns find it difficult to realize that during the Civil War the actions of men were guided much more by religious than by political ideas. Changes in the form and constitution of government were estimated with regard to their effect on religion rather than with reference to their merits as affecting the right of taxation or any such worldly interest.

The 'New Model', Battle of Naseby.—Early in 1645 Cromwell had his way, and succeeded in carrying through Parliament a 'Self-denying Ordinance' requiring all members of the Houses to resign their army commissions, and also put in force a scheme called the 'New Model', for reorganizing the army on the model of his famous regiment, nicknamed the Ironsides. In

June he was appointed Lieutenant-General. In the following month, when the opposing armies met at Naseby in Northamptonshire (June 14, 1645), the result of good leadership and efficient organization on the side of the Parliament was the utter rout of the royal army with a loss of about 1,000 killed and 5,000 prisoners, while Cromwell's force equal in number, lost only 200. From that moment the king became a fugitive, hunted about from place to place. All his private papers fell into the hands of his opponents. In September Prince Rupert was forced to surrender Bristol.

Montrose in Scotland.—The efforts of the Marquess of Montrose in Scotland to help the king did no good. With the support of the Highlanders the marquess became master of Scotland for barely a month, but he could not keep his wild men together and was finally defeated at Philiphaugh in September 1645. Charles, having failed to obtain the effective aid he hoped for from Ireland, surrendered to the Scots in May 1646, becoming practically a prisoner in their hands. The First Civil War thus ended.

Execution of Archbishop Laud—So far back as December 1640 Archbishop Laud had been committed to the Tower on charges of alleged treason for attempting to change the religion and fundamental laws of the kingdom, and had lain there almost forgotten, until in 1643 Parliament accepted the Presbyterian Government and gave the Scots an opportunity of taking vengeance on the man whom they most hated.¹ Impeachment proceedings were resumed, but, as in the case of Strafford, were dropped in favour of the more convenient process by attainder, which needed no legal proofs (*ante*, p. 186 note). In spite of a sealed pardon from the king, the archbishop was executed in January 1645, for no crime known

¹ In 1638 the Scotch had bound themselves together by signing a covenant or agreement to resist the plan of Charles for forcing on them the Anglican Church government and worship. As accepted by the English Parliament in 1643 the document was called the Solemn League and Covenant.

to law. He was an honest bigot, a faithful servant of the king, and died as a brave gentleman should die.

The Power of the Army.—Long discussions between the Scots and the English Parliament—or what was left of it—resulted in the payment of £200,000 to the Scots, who gave up the king to the parliamentary officers in February 1647. But real power had already passed from the hands of Parliament into those of the victorious and now veteran army, which was resolved not to allow a few Presbyterian gentlemen sitting at Westminster to throw away the fruits of the victories gained by arms. *The leaders of the army accordingly sent a cavalry officer to fetch the king, whose person they secured in June. At the beginning of August they occupied London, the strong hold of the Presbyterians. From that date parliamentary government, although maintained in form for a time, really disappeared, and until the Restoration the substance of power remained for nearly thirteen years in the hands of a military despotism. Cromwell, who had become by the force of his character the commanding spirit of the revolution, was determined to beat down all opposition whether that of the king, the Presbyterian Parliament, or the extreme army fanatics, known as Levellers, and to secure religious liberty as he understood it.*

Scotch Invasion ; Battles of Preston and Wigan.—In November 1647 the king escaped from custody and fled to Carisbrooke Castle in the Isle of Wight, only to find a new prison. While there he entered into treaty with the Scots, promising to establish officially their Presbyterian form of religion. The Scots, who were unwilling that the King of Scotland should remain in the power of Englishmen only, appointed the Duke of Hamilton as Commander-in-Chief of an army for the support of the king's cause by the invasion of England. Cromwell, with a much smaller force, met the invaders in Lancashire and destroyed their army in bloody battles fought at Preston and Wigan (August 1648). 'We have killed,' he wrote, 'we know not what, but a very great number, having done

execution upon them above thirty miles together besides what we killed in the two great fights' The loss on the side of the Parliament was extremely small

'Pride's Purge', the 'Rump' Parliament—Ireton son in law of Cromwell now openly declared that it was useless to go on treating with the king who should be put to death. In December a party of soldiers under Colonel Pride cleared out of the House of Commons all members opposed to the views of Cromwell and Ireton leaving a miserable remnant known contemptuously as the Rump which continued to sit and pretend to be a lawful Parliament. The Colonel's action was spoken of as Pride's Purge.

Execution of the King—The faction which had secured control by violence was now resolved regardless of the nation's will to destroy the king. Accordingly on the first day of January 1649 a so called High Court of Justice was constituted which after a mock trial condemned Charles to death. On January 30 he was beheaded in front of the palace of Whitehall. He died with dignity and at once became a saint and martyr in popular estimation so that all his faults were forgotten nothing being remembered but his shocking end. There is no doubt that nearly all parties in the nation disapproved of the execution which was the act of Ireton, Cromwell and a few other resolute men who had worked themselves up to the belief that they were the instruments of God chosen by Him to punish and destroy the man of blood as they called the king on whom alone they placed the burden of responsibility for seven years of bloodshed and misery. They soon found that it was easier to destroy than to build and that they could not devise a workable constitution without a king. The bond that had held the three kingdoms together was dissolved. Prince Charles was proclaimed king in Scotland while in Ireland his cause had many adherents and even in England the claim of Parliament to be the supreme authority was rejected by the majority of the nation.

The Commonwealth 1649-53—The irregular Government

formed in England after the execution of the king lasted for nearly five years from January 30, 1649, to December 16, 1653, with certain intermediate changes which need not be detailed. That period of practically military rule, thinly disguised in parliamentary forms, is called by historians that of the Commonwealth to distinguish it from the more regular Protectorate, which lasted nearly as long until Cromwell's death on September 3, 1658. Until April 20, 1653, when Cromwell roughly turned out the remnant of the Long Parliament, the control nominally remained in the hands of fifty or sixty members of the Rump, with an Executive Council of State selected from their body. Ormonde rightly described the members as 'the dregs and scum of the House of Commons picked and awed by the army', which was the real ruler of the nation, and was itself dominated by the master spirit of Cromwell in the background.

Events in Ireland, 1641-9 —Cromwell during the four years following the beheading of Charles had made himself practically lord of the three kingdoms by the conquest of both Ireland and Scotland. The rebellion of the native Irish, begun on October 22, 1641, and accompanied by terrible massacres of English settlers, had been going on ever since (*ante* p. 187). Its immediate cause was the 'Plantation of Ulster' by James I (*ante*, p. 178), but the war had quickly assumed a religious character as a conflict between Roman Catholics and Protestants. Most of the Anglo Irish Catholic landholders joined the rebels. The incessant fighting which desolated the country, and before it was finished had destroyed nearly half the population of the island was carried on between three main parties, the Irish rebels, the royalists under the Marquess of Ormonde, and parliamentary troops under various commanders. In 1643 the marquess made a truce with the Irish rebels known as the Cessation, which was imperfectly observed, and was never recognized by either the Scots or the Parliament at Westminster. In 1646 the truce was renewed under express orders from the king. After the execution of Charles I.,

Ormonde took out a fresh commission as Lord-Lieutenant from his son, acknowledged by him as Charles II, in whose name he held a large part of the country with Catholic support, but was badly defeated by the Parliament forces at Rathmines near Dublin immediately before the arrival of Cromwell.

Cromwell's Irish policy.—The Parliament had not been able until after the king's death to attend closely to the affairs of Ireland, but as soon as possible an army was organized for the conquest of the island, and Cromwell was appointed Commander in Chief (March 1649). In August he landed at Dublin, resolved to revenge the massacres of 1641, to prevent all open exercise of the Roman Catholic worship, to make Ireland Puritan and to substitute Protestant British settlers for the native Irish, so far as might be practicable. His policy was avowedly based on the maxim of James I. 'Plant Ireland with Puritans, root out Papists, and then secure it.'

Storm of Drogheda.—In pursuance of this policy he first attacked Drogheda, a fortified town north of Dublin¹. The garrison having refused to surrender, the place was stormed and all persons found in arms were either put to the sword or sent to the West Indies. The slaughter included many of the townspeople and every Roman Catholic monk or priest. Cromwell declared his willingness to allow liberty of opinion on religion, but by that he meant merely that he did not inquire into opinions privately held or desire to enforce absolute uniformity of worship among Protestant sects, Presbyterians, Independents, and so forth. He refused even to consider proposals to allow Roman Catholics to celebrate mass, the most solemn and essential rite of their form of the Christian religion, treating all Catholic priests as outlaws worthy of death in virtue of their office. Writing to the Speaker after the storm he used these words

I am persuaded that this is a righteous judgement of God

¹ The name is pronounced nearly as 'Drawhada'. Cromwell used the obsolete name Tredah or Tredagh.

upon these barbarous wretches, who have imbrued their hands in so much innocent blood ; and that it will tend to prevent the effusion of blood for the future Which are the satisfactory grounds to such actions, which otherwise cannot but work remorse and regret. . . . And now give me leave to say how it comes to pass that this work is wrought . . . That which caused your men to storm so courageously, it was the Spirit of God, who gave your men courage, and took it away again ; and gave the enemy courage, and took it away again ; and gave your men courage again and therewith this happy success And therefore it is good that God alone have all the glory '

The writer does not shrink from giving the horrible details of the massacre The language used, however shocking, or almost blasphemous, it may appear to a modern reader, undoubtedly was perfectly sincere and expressed accurately the sentiments which guided Cromwell and his followers throughout his career

Completion of Conquest of Ireland.—Wexford, to the south of Dublin, was treated in nearly the same merciless fashion, and by the end of May 1650, when Cromwell returned to England, the greater part of Ireland was held by the Puritan forces He left his son in law Ireton to complete the conquest The work of Ireton, who died of the plague in November 1651, was carried on by others, and in September 1653 all fighting had ceased The land settlement will be described presently.

Battles of Dunbar and Worcester.—Cromwell was recalled to fight the Scots, who had taken up the cause of Charles II, then in Scotland The battle which came off at Dunbar on the coast to the east of Edinburgh (Sept 3, 1650), resulted in the total defeat of the Scots although they were about twice as numerous as the English In the year following, Charles joined another Scotch army which invaded England. At Worcester on the Severn the Scots were met by Cromwell with a much superior force, and utterly routed (Sept 3, 1651), exactly a year after the fight of Dunbar The young king made his escape to the Continent after many adventures

War with Holland (the Netherlands).—The Navigation Act of 1651 requiring that all goods brought into England should be carried either in English ships or in those belonging to the country whence the goods came was very hurtful to the Dutch, who made much money by carrying the goods of all nations in their vessels. Disputes concerning that Act and other matters brought on war. Many naval battles took place, in some of which the Dutch admirals, Van Tromp and de Ruyter, were victorious, but in July 1653 the English admiral, Monk, destroyed their fleet and killed Van Tromp. In 1654 Holland had to accept terms of peace which included a heavy payment to the heirs of the traders murdered at Amboyna (*ante*, p. 175).

Barebone's Parliament.—Cromwell, after dismissing the Rump in April 1653, tried the experiment of calling a nominated assembly of men all supposed to be godly Puritans, selected on the recommendation of ministers of religion, and designed to do the work of a Parliament. He could not venture to convoke a genuine elected House of Commons, because free elections would have resulted in a royalist assembly. The nominated body, called the Little Parliament, or in mockery, Barebone's Parliament, from the fanciful name of one of the members Praise God Barebone, although it included some notable persons proved to be incapable of useful work, and was soon dissolved.

The Protectorate.—In December 1653, the army officers drew up an Instrument of Government, in virtue of which Oliver Cromwell became 'Lord Protector of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland'. This measure, modified in 1657, gave the Government a more regular form, and allowed Cromwell to exercise in a semilegal way authority which in practice had been chiefly vested in his hands since the execution of the King. In 1654 and 1656 the Lord Protector summoned two so-called Parliaments to help him. But both assemblies represented only a faction, not the nation, and he was obliged to dissolve them as being useless.

and obstructive¹ For a year (1655-6) the country was governed openly by martial law, administered by major generals. Many people desired that Cromwell should be crowned as king, but the army opposed the idea, and he dared not accept the crown.

Personal History of Oliver Cromwell.—We may here pause to say a few words on the personal history of Oliver Cromwell, who became the acknowledged sovereign of England on December 16, 1653, and retained power until his death on September 3, 1658. He was a younger son of a land-owning family in Huntingdon, which had occupied a good position for several generations. His great grandfather, Sir Richard Cromwell, was nephew of Thomas Cromwell, Earl of Essex, the despotic minister of Henry VIII (*ante*, p. 138), and his grandfather, Sir Henry of Hinchinbrook, was known as the 'golden knight' on account of the splendour with which he lived. Oliver became a member of Parliament in 1628, and was again elected member of both the Short and the Long Parliaments in 1640. Hampden and many other prominent members of the Long Parliament were his relations either by blood or marriage. His military genius, as we have seen (*ante*, p. 192), first came into prominent notice at Marston Moor in 1644. The remodelling of the army and the battle of Naseby in the following year made him the most influential man in England. After his victories in Ireland, at Dunbar, and at Worcester (1649-51) his claim to be the ruler of the Commonwealth was beyond dispute. When he became Lord Protector he was fifty-four years of age.

The 'Cromwellian Settlement of Ireland'.—Just before the outbreak of the Civil War in 1642 a statute had been assented to by the king decreeing the forfeiture of the greater part of the land of Ireland as a penalty for the rebellion begun in the previous year, and providing for the colonization or 'plantation' of the forfeited lands by British soldiers and settlers.

¹ His 'Parliaments' were remarkable for including members from both Scotland and Ireland.

then called 'adventurers' The English Parliament was not able to go on with the scheme until ten years later when the Act of Settlement was passed (1652), laying down in detail the rules for the gigantic operation proposed, which was designed both to pay off the heavy arrears due to the army of conquest, and to replace a Catholic by a Protestant population It was found impossible to carry out the scheme at all completely, but during 1654 very many of the Irish were 'transplanted' to Connaught, the western province, to their great distress and by 1656 operations had nearly ended The transaction, so far as it was effected, was made feasible by an elaborate survey ably conducted by Sir William Petty The net result was that about two thirds of the better land in the island were left in the hands of Protestants, and the old Irish sept or clan system was finally destroyed

The operation, however cannot be considered a real success It was a development of the mistaken policy of the Tudors, the traditional policy of England, which assumed that Ireland, a totally different country, must be governed in exactly the same way as England and profess the same religion That policy acted on by Cromwell more thoroughly than by any of his predecessors established an undying enmity between the different sections of the population which the laws of modern times have not succeeded in quenching The confiscation was accompanied by systematic persecution of the Catholic form of religion, an 'oath of abjuration' being imposed on all suspected persons, which obliged them to abjure or renounce all the special doctrines of the Roman Catholic faith on pain of losing two-thirds of their property of all kinds A 'settlement' made on such an unjust basis could not be satisfactory, and it was maintained only by 'penal laws' of ever increasing severity directed against the Roman Catholics always the majority of the population, which were not finally repealed until 1829

Deportation.—Concurrently with the 'settlement' large numbers of Irish men and women were deported to the

American colonies and the West Indian Islands, where their condition was little better than one of slavery. About 34,000 of the Catholic soldiery were allowed to emigrate to Spain, France, and Flanders. Those who went to Spain were shockingly ill used, but the 20,000 or so who found refuge in France were better treated, and obtained honourable employment. Some highly distinguished Frenchmen are of Irish descent.

The War with Spain.—The last three years of Cromwell's reign (1655–8) were mainly occupied by a war with Spain, which power he hated as being the champion of the Catholic cause and the enemy of Protestantism. Cromwell's foreign policy, like his home government, was mainly determined by his strong religious convictions, and it was his earnest desire to make England the head of a league of all the Protestant powers of Europe, including Sweden and Denmark. In 1657 Blake destroyed a Spanish fleet at Santa Cruz in the Canary Islands, and in the following year the Protector's forces annexed the port of Dunkirk, then in Spanish Flanders, but now in French territory. The failure of an attack on the West Indian island of San Domingo or Hispaniola was balanced by the annexation of Jamaica at the beginning of the war.

Death of Cromwell.—In 1658 the gradual failure of Cromwell's health became noticeable and he was much shaken by the death of a favourite daughter in August. During his last illness he was understood to express a wish to be succeeded by Richard, his elder surviving son. On September 3, the anniversary of his victories of Dunbar and Worcester, he died in the sixtieth year of his age. His funeral was celebrated with extraordinary magnificence.

Policy and Character of Cromwell.—No name in the annals of England excites emotions so diverse as those aroused by the name of Oliver Cromwell. The distance between a monster and a hero, the contrast between loathing and reverence may serve as measures of the divergence of opinion. But the greatness of the man is undeniable, and was fully admitted

by Clarendon, the royalist historian who declared that 'his greatness at home was but a shadow of the glory he had abroad' A plain country gentleman by education, he suddenly appears when past forty years of age as one of the most skilful generals in Europe, and the most uniformly successful, equally versed in discipline the art of controlling armed forces, in tactics, the art of marshalling troops on the battlefield, and in strategy, the art of planning a campaign

Success Abroad—At his command the dishonour of Amboyna was avenged, the pirates of Algiers were chastised, the suffering Protestants of Savoy were relieved the pride of Spain was humbled, the empire of the sea was transferred from Holland to Britain and the flag of St George was honoured in every ocean 'It was hard to discover says Clarendon 'which feared him most France, Spain or the Low Countries' Truly, he was a great Englishman 'A larger soul I think,' observed a gentleman of his household 'hath seldom dwelt in a house of clay than his was

Failure and Success at Home—At home he was hampered by the fact that he was never more than the head of a faction, and was therefore forced to rely on the power of the sword, and to govern with all the arbitrariness or more of the Tudors and Stuarts But what a man could do under the conditions he did

'Apart from its dictatorial character Mr Harrison writes, 'the Protector's government was efficient just moderate, and wise Opposed as he was by lawyers he made some of the best judges England ever had Justice and law opened a new era The services were raised to their highest efficiency. Trade and commerce revived under his fostering care Education was reorganized, the Universities reformed, Durham founded¹ It is an opponent who says, 'All England over, these were Halcyon Days'² Men of learning of all opinions

¹ Cromwell's college at Durham was suppressed after the Restoration The small existing university dates only from 1833

² 'Halcyon' that is 'calm or tranquil The halcyon or kingfisher was believed to build its nest and lay eggs in calm weather only

were encouraged and befriended 'If there was a man in England," says Neal, 'who excelled in any faculty or science, the Protector would find him out, and reward him according to his merit' It was the Protector's brother-in-law, Warden of Wadham College, who there gathered together the group which ultimately founded the Royal Society'

John Milton was Cromwell's Foreign Secretary, and lost his sight from overwork in his patron's cause His poem, *Paradise Lost*, 'the epic of Puritanism,' helps the student of history to understand the spirit in which Cromwell laboured.

The Man.—The conflict of feeling rages round the man Cromwell himself Even in his own time few Englishmen or Scotsmen could forgive him for the execution of their king and the blood of Charles ever called from the ground against him In Ireland 'the curse of Cromwell' is proverbial to this day, and the descendants of those who suffered from his sword and settlement' execrate his memory with hatred, which no consideration of his glories can modify He was the typical Puritan, with the qualities and defects of the type, and must always remain odious to those who dislike the Puritan character, while those who admire that character will be lenient to his errors, and loud in their praise of his virtues Certainly, he was not a hypocrite However much his perpetual appeals to the Divine Name may jar on modern taste, he meant what he said in all sincerity, believing himself to be the chosen instrument of God for the chastisement of the 'malignant' supporters of popery and prelacy,¹ even as the Hebrews of old believed themselves to have been chosen to smite the heathen Amalekites as described in the Old Testament While accepting with all his heart the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith, his public action was guided by the example of the bloodthirsty zealots of Israel rather than by the gospel of love In private life he was all that a good man ought to be

¹ 'Prelacy,' the government of a church by prelates or bishops, a system which Cromwell could not even tolerate.

Richard Cromwell—His elder son Richard succeeded to the seat of the mighty as Lord Protector without opposition just as if he had been the son of a lawful king. But he was a spiritless man of little force of character devoid of ambition and unable to control the army which was the real master of the state. The republican fanatics headed by Sir Harry Vane would not endure his rule and forced him to dissolve the Parliament which he had summoned. The dissolution as intended involved the abdication of Richard who quietly retired into private life in May 1659 saying in reply to remonstrances 'I will not have a drop of blood spilt for the preservation of my greatness which is a burden to me'. Thus timely the Protectorate came to an end. After the Restoration Richard withdrew to the Continent but twenty years later returned to England and died in his bed at the age of eighty six in 1712. His brother Henry Lord Lieutenant of Ireland likewise refused greatness retired from office and lived in peace on his estate in Huntingdonshire until his death.

The Restoration, Declaration of Breda—The Independents tried to carry on a republican government by recalling the few surviving members of the Long Parliament but the nation was weary of them and showed an unmistakable desire for the return of the king. General Monk commanding in Scotland put himself at the head of the royalist movement which the republicans were not strong enough to oppose. A makeshift Convention Parliament was summoned and Charles was brought home with practically unanimous consent. He entered London as King Charles II on his birthday May 29 1660 a day which was long observed as the date of the happy restoration of the monarchy. Before leaving Holland Charles signed the Declaration of Breda offering a general pardon to his opponents with certain exceptions, and promising that 'no man shall be disquieted or called in question for differences of opinion in matters of religion'.

Permanent Results of the Civil War—At first sight it would seem as if the Civil War had been fruitless and had ended

merely in the substitution of Charles II for Charles I. But it was not so. Although the irregular government of the Commonwealth and Protectorate had been quite as despotic as that of any Tudor or Stuart king, the old monarchy was gone for ever, and the instruments of its power were broken. No man could revive the Courts of the Star Chamber and High Commission, or confine the powers of Parliament within the limits prescribed by Elizabeth. The people had learned their strength, and the restored Stuarts had to bow before it. When James II tried to act on the divine right theory of his father, he had to go, and make room for a king who would recognize the lawful bounds of his authority. The final triumph of the Revolution of 1688 was the direct outcome of the work of the Long Parliament. But the attempt of the Puritans to establish the reign of the saints and to make everybody virtuous after their fashion failed, and produced a temporary reaction against virtue itself, at least in the ruling classes. The good of Puritanism, however, survived, and as Green observes, left the mass of Englishmen serious, earnest, sober in life and conduct, firm in their love of Protestantism and freedom. Cromwell's notion of limited toleration of opinions contrary to those of the Government prepared the way for the more complete freedom secured at the Revolution, and the later changes which have swept away by degrees all official restraint on liberty of thought or worship. The Declaration of Breda shows the advance that had been made from the old position of absolute intolerance, although the promise made was not kept.

LEADING DATES

Battle of Edgehill	•	1642
The Cessation in Ireland		1643
Battle of Marston Moor		1644
Battle of Naseby	defeat of Montrose	1645
bishop Laud	execution of Arch	1648
Battles of Preston and Wigan		1648
Execution of the king	the Commonwealth	Cromwell in
Ireland	storm of Drogheda and Wexford	1649

in the Civil War being commonly spoken of as Cavaliers
That Parliament lasted for seventeen and a half years

Worthless Character of Charles II.—Charles was not in any way worthy of the passionate loyalty with which he was received. He was an extremely clever scoundrel, licentious, selfish, cynical, faithless, unprincipled, and utterly indifferent to the honour of his country, but firmly resolved, as he said, not to 'set out on his travels again'. The fear of being forced to do so was the principal check on his conduct, and kept him from carrying too far the despotic tyranny to which he was inclined. His main objects were to maintain the royal authority as far as possible against Parliament, and to secure the succession to the throne for his brother. But, while striving continually to attain those two objects by crooked devices of all sorts, he never forgot the warning given by his father's fate. His support of his brother's right to the crown was not prompted by love for James, whom he hated, but by his resolve to maintain the legal succession in his family.

Lord Clarendon.—For the first seven years of his reign he enjoyed the faithful services of Edward Hyde, the companion and counsellor of his exile, whom he made Earl of Clarendon. Charles, so far as he thought of religion at all, preferred the Roman Catholic form. For many years he was secretly attached to the Catholic Church and on his deathbed avowed his formal adhesion to it. The English people, however, had made up their minds to keep their own independent national church and to guard it against the Roman Catholics on the one side and the Puritans on the other. Charles was anxious to secure indulgence for the Roman Catholics indirectly by granting it to the Puritan sects first, and then extending it to the Catholics. But the Parliament would have no such policy, and under Clarendon's guidance passed four extremely intolerant Acts, including an Act of Uniformity, known collectively as the 'Clarendon Code', which were intended to force everybody to belong to the Anglican Church.


Popular Support of the Anglican Church; Dissenters.—In

consequence, the ministers of many parishes were expelled from their appointments and reduced to the greatest distress,¹ while the prisons were crowded with people who had broken the new laws. The only excuse that can be offered for such laws is that the nation was still suffering from the effects of the long-continued troubles, and was nervously afraid of both Popery and Puritanism. The Church of Rome was associated in men's minds with the burnings under Bloody Mary (*ante*, p 147), the massacre of St Bartholomew's Day (*ante*, p 151), the Gunpowder Plot (*ante*, p 168) and the ever growing despotism of the intolerant French monarchy which was taking the place formerly occupied by Spain. The fact that James, Duke of York, brother of the king and heir apparent to the Crown, was a zealous Catholic caused the deepest anxiety and gave occasion to well grounded fears that when he should succeed to the throne he would use his royal power to exalt his church and destroy the Anglican. Puritanism was associated with tyranny of a kind different from that of Rome but equally odious, which interfered with innocent customs and amusements, while tending to encourage canting pretenders to godliness. Samuel Butler's mock heroic poem, *Hudibras*, first published three years after the Restoration, well expresses the popular dislike of Puritan manners. Consequently the bulk of the people hating both Popery and Puritanism, resolved to give the strongest possible support to their national Anglican Church. In the seventeenth century all parties were agreed that the best way to support a Church was by forcibly driving everybody into its fold. That notion, which seems silly now, was accepted by the wisest statesmen of those days. Both Charles II and his successor found the English sentiment in favour of the Anglican Church and

¹ In England a parish is the area attached to the church served by a rector or vicar of the Established or Anglican Church. It often coincides with the manor, a body of tenants under one landlord and is the unit for many purposes of civil administration poor law, &c. Each diocese or bishop's jurisdiction includes hundreds of parishes.

against its rivals too strong for them, and much against their will were forced to yield to it. Charles gave way in time; James was too late in his surrender.

The dispossessed ministers gradually collected congregations, which obtained a certain amount of liberty under William III, and were formed in course of time into distinct organized sects of Baptists, Methodists, Congregationalists, and innumerable others, now spoken of collectively as Dissenters, Nonconformists, or the Free Churches. Those sects are still a powerful influence in politics, especially in matters concerning education.



COPY OF CHARLES II: BOMBAY RUPEE

New Charter of East India Company.—Although the war of the sects largely occupied the minds of Englishmen they could think of other things also. The eastern trade continued to grow, and many people were engaged without knowing it in laying the foundations of the Indian Empire. The year after his restoration Charles granted a new charter to the East India Company (1661), giving the Company power to strike coins, to administer justice in the settlements, and to deal sharply with 'interlopers', that is to say, private traders not engaged in the Company's service. Those powers were confirmed by later charters. An early Bombay rupee is here figured. The Company prospered for many years after the Restoration, as appears from the fact that in 1683 £100 stock were worth £360. After that date the affairs of the Company

began to decline, until 1708 when improved arrangements revived its prosperity.

Cession of Bombay by the Portuguese.—Bombay became English territory as part of the dowry of the Portuguese princess, Catharine of Braganza, whom Charles married in 1662. The cession was made by the Portuguese in order to secure English help against the Dutch. The value of the new acquisition was so little understood that the Crown a few years later granted the port and island to the East India Company to be held in perpetuity 'on payment of the annual rent of £10 in gold on the 30th September in each year'. Tangier in Morocco in northern Africa, ceded by the Portuguese at the same time, was abandoned in 1683. The site of Madras had been bought in 1639 during the reign of Charles I.

The French 'Compagnie des Indes'.—The French East India Company, 'La Compagnie des Indes,' was founded in 1664 by Colbert, the Finance Minister of Louis XIV, to whom several long letters were addressed by the traveller Bernier. For various reasons, want of capital being one, the French Company never made much progress. The town of Pondicherry on the Madras Coast, founded in 1674, fell into the hands of the English twice in the eighteenth century, but was given back to the French who still hold it.

War with Holland; Plague and Fire of London.—Various disputes about trade matters, combined with the personal hostility of Charles to the Dutch, brought on war between England and Holland in 1664. During the next year (1665) most parts of England suffered from a terrible outbreak of plague, which raged in London with great violence. In the year following the larger part of London was consumed by a fire which lasted for five days, and, of course, caused immense loss. But the loss was balanced by gain, the fire having cleared away the old unwholesome streets, so that the plague has never returned. There is no doubt that plague takes hold only of places where dirt and insanitary conditions prevail.

Peace of Breda —The French king joined the Dutch in 1666, so that England had to fight France as well as Holland. The Government of Charles managed so ill that a Dutch fleet sailed up the mouth of the Thames and burnt three war ships near London a thing that could not have happened in Cromwell's time. In the same year (1667) the Peace of Breda was signed under which England gave up all claims to the Spice Islands east of Borneo while Holland surrendered certain territory in North America including the site of New York.

Fall of Clarendon —About the same time both the House of Commons and the king for different reasons quarrelled with Clarendon. Proceedings were taken to impeach the minister, who retired to France from which he never came back.

The 'Cabal', Secret Treaty of Dover —After the fall of Clarendon Charles kept the control of business largely in his own hands being helped in an informal way by five noble men—Clifford Arlington Buckingham Ashley and Lauderdale—who are sometimes spoken of incorrectly as the Cabal Ministry. In those days there was no regular ministry and the king pleased himself as to the person on whom he should bestow his confidence. In 1668 a triple alliance between England the Dutch Republic and Sweden put an end to the French war. But Charles while pretending to be opposed to France was all the time treacherously corresponding with King Louis XIV and striving to make himself independent of parliamentary grants by securing a regular income from the French treasury. By a shameful secret bargain the Treaty of Dover (1670) Charles made himself the servant of the king of France whom he agreed to help against the Dutch, receiving in return £230 000 a year and a promise of French troops to support him in England whenever he should need help against his Protestant subjects. Other provisions were also inserted in the agreement the most disgraceful ever made by an English king. The next year Charles succeeded in obtaining a large sum from Parliament on false pretences of course concealing the secret treaty with Louis.

The 'Dispensing Power'; Test Act.—In 1672 Charles, who still dared not avow himself to be a Catholic, issued a Declaration of Indulgence, giving complete liberty of worship to all sects, including both Nonconformists (*ante*, p. 210) and Roman Catholics. Such a declaration violated a long series of statutes, but the king claimed to possess in virtue of his office a 'dispensing power', enabling him to suspend the execution of laws which he did not like. It is plain that there is not much use in Parliament passing laws if the king can tell people that they need not obey them. Next year the pressure of Parliament forced Charles to withdraw the Declaration, which, though just in itself, was in advance of public opinion at the time and was an arbitrary exercise of royal power. Parliament, far from accepting the policy of the Declaration, insisted on passing a strict Test Act, which excluded all sincere Catholics from office by requiring them to pass the test of renouncing the most essential doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church (1673).

Second War with Holland, Dismissal of Shaftesbury — Meantime Charles and his counsellor Ashley now Earl of Shaftesbury, had drawn the country into a second war with Holland in which the English fleet was unsuccessful. Peace was signed in 1674. The nation, which did not know about the Treaty of Dover, wished to be friends with Holland, and to oppose France. The Duke of York became more unpopular than ever by marrying an Italian princess, Mary of Modena, a strong Catholic. Shaftesbury, who had found out about the secret treaty with France supported the Test Act and was dismissed from office. For the rest of his life he tried to secure toleration for Protestant Dissenters, while influencing the popular hostility to the Catholic cause.

Lord Danby Minister; Marriage of William and Mary — From 1675 the king left home affairs chiefly in the hands of the Earl of Danby, who tried to maintain the policy of Clarendon by supporting the Church of England. The minister wished to oppose France, but Charles, who was in

the pay of Louis would not allow a quarrel with the French king. In 1678 Louis made peace with the Dutch (Peace of Nimeguen). In the previous year William Prince of Orange, the leading personage in Holland and an active Protestant, had been married to Mary, daughter of James Duke of York. This arrangement was accepted by James as being likely to make his own succession to the throne easier. In the end it cost him his crown.

The Popish Plot, 1678-81 —In those days the kingdom was terrified at the prospect of a Popish king and feared not without reason that its liberties would be suppressed by a French army. A rascal named Titus Oates who had been at Jesuit colleges¹ took advantage of this feeling to give detailed information of a supposed Popish plot aiming at the murder of Charles and the replacing of him by his brother James Duke of York, an avowed Catholic. Recent researches have proved that a meeting of Jesuits actually was held on April 24 1678 at the Duke of York's residence St James's Palace. Oates knew of the fact of the meeting but falsely deposed to its having taken place elsewhere. The informer's depositions were taken in September by an active magistrate Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey. In October when it became known that he had been murdered all England jumped to the conclusion that the crime was the work of the Jesuits and intense excitement arose. So far as can be made out the popular guess was right. Sir Godfrey really appears to have been murdered at Somerset House the queen's residence by Jesuits who feared that he would reveal the secret of the Jesuit meeting at St James's Palace. If that fact had then become known James would have lost all chance of succeeding.

¹ The Order of Jesuits or Society of Jesus, founded by Ignatius Loyola, a Spaniard, and sanctioned by the Pope in 1540 is a highly organized religious order the members of which are trained with much care and bound to implicit obedience. They are reputed to be masters of intrigue. Many attempts to suppress the order have failed and it is still powerful. St Francis Xavier, the missionary in India, was a Jesuit.

to the throne¹ The cipher correspondence of Coleman, secretary to the Duchess of York, which was seized, proved beyond doubt the existence of a treasonable conspiracy to overthrow the English Church and make England a Catholic state with the aid of French gold. As Dryden says :—

in the Plot

Some truth there was, but dashed and brewed with lies.

Oates and other informers poured out a torrent of false evidence which was believed by the courts of justice and led to the conviction and execution of many innocent persons. Rightly or wrongly so great a man as the Archbishop of Dublin was one of the victims. He was not executed until July 1681. At the end of 1680 Lord Stafford was convicted on false evidence, honestly believed by the jury to be true, and his head fell amidst the groans and curses of the London mob, always strongly Protestant²

The First Short Parliament.—During the time of the Popish Plot excitement (1678-81) other events of importance happened. The long ' Cavalier Parliament ' was dissolved at the beginning of 1679. When a new Parliament met shortly afterwards it insisted on impeaching Lord Danby and taking steps by the Exclusion Bill to exclude the Duke of York from the succession. Charles in wrath dissolved the assembly in May.

The Habeas Corpus Act.—It had found time to pass only one notable statute, known to lawyers as the Habeas Corpus Act (1679), which obliges judges and jailers to abstain from illegal imprisonment of subjects, and so to respect the clause of Magna Carta providing that ' no freeman shall be taken and imprisoned unless by the lawful judgement of his peers or by the law of the land '. The name of the Act is derived from the opening Latin words of the writ requiring the production

¹ The Duke of York may or may not have approved of the murder, but there is no reason to suspect the queen, although Sir Edmund was strangled in her palace, Old Somerset House.

² The current story, accepted even by Gardiner, that the crowd cried ' God bless you, my lord, we believe you, my lord ! ' is false. Conclusive proofs are given by Pollock, *The Popish Plot* (1903), p. 370.

of a prisoner in open court. In all ordinary times the Act has proved an effective guardian of liberty, but it has been suspended occasionally when the country has been disturbed.

The Second Short Parliament.—Another Parliament met in October 1680, and proved to be equally Protestant. Shaftesbury, helped by a powerful secret society called the Green Ribbon Club, made the utmost possible use of the terror caused by the supposed Popish Plot, and worked hard to exclude James, and give the throne to the Duke of Monmouth, the eldest illegitimate son of Charles¹. False tales to the effect that the Duke's mother had been legally married to the king were spread abroad and eagerly believed. After a three months' session, during which the Lords rejected the Exclusion Bill, Charles again dissolved Parliament.

The Third Short Parliament at Oxford.—The king, who saw that the Popish Plot excitement was wearing out, and supposed that popular feeling was beginning to turn in his favour, arranged that his next Parliament should meet at Oxford, away from Protestant London. But when the House of Commons met it proved to be as much in opposition as ever. The leaders on both sides came armed to Oxford, and matters looked as if civil war might break out again. The king boldly resolved to dissolve the Parliament, which had sat for only a week. He carried out his design cleverly and found that he was supported by the nation.

Whig and Tory.—During these years of intrigue the familiar party names Whig and Tory first came into use. Both terms were mere nicknames. Whig is an abbreviation of a Scotch term 'whigamore', a slang name for the 'covenanting' peasantry of western Scotland. Tory, originally meaning a robber or dacoit in Ireland, was applied abusively to the court party. Shaftesbury's followers gradually became known as Whigs.

¹ The eldest son generally known to exist. There was one, James Stuart, born earlier, who became a Jesuit priest and remained in obscurity. He visited the king in 1668 (Pollock, p. 26).

Personal Government of Charles, 1681-5.—The panic excited by the Popish Plot having spent itself, people began to see that they had been led into injustice by believing lying rogues. The tendency now was the other way, so that certain Whigs were convicted and even executed on slight grounds. Shaftesbury left the country, and died in Holland (January 1693). Charles, an exceedingly artful and unscrupulous man, took full advantage of the change in public opinion and proceeded to take steps to secure his personal power. On pretence that privileges had been abused he compelled the judges to cancel the charters of London and many other towns and managed to do without a Parliament for the rest of his reign, being kept supplied with cash from France.

The Rye House Plot—Some of the more extreme Whigs wished to kill him, and joined for that purpose in the Rye House Plot (1683), which was detected. In consequence of that event several of the Whig leaders were arrested. Lord Russell and Algernon Sidney were the most prominent of those convicted of treason and executed. If they did not commit treason they certainly went very near to it and were in the secrets of the Green Ribbon Club.

Death of Charles II—In February 1685 Charles had a convulsive fit, and died after a few days' illness. In the short interval he was formally received into the Roman Catholic Church. According to some authorities he had been secretly a Catholic since 1669. He was a man of scandalously immoral life, and wasted enormous sums on his numerous mistresses and illegitimate children. Three existing English dukes are descended from him.


Accession of James II; his Opinions.—The much dreaded Duke of York, then about fifty-two years of age, was quietly proclaimed and accepted as King James II of England and VII of Scotland. He declared officially that it would be his 'endevour to preserve this government both in Church and State as it is now by law established'. Men were so much afraid of civil war breaking out again that they were willing

to take him at his word and to believe that he really meant to maintain the Church of England. But James was a Catholic first, an Englishman afterwards and it was impossible for a man as zealous as he was for the Church to which he belonged to support with sincerity a heretic Church. Moreover he was a thorough Stuart a firm believer in his father's doctrine of the divine right of kings and an ardent admirer of the despotism of his friend and patron Louis XIV of France. He continued like his brother to be the dependant and servant of the French king. In these circumstances trouble between him and his people was bound to arise.



COIN OF JAMES II IRISH PEWTER CROWN

Parliament Assembled—While Duke of York he had restrained his feelings and had submitted to the restriction of attending mass in a private chapel with closed doors. But after God had once raised him to this crown he could not hope for the blessing of God if he did not venture to confess his religion openly which he did accordingly in the most public way and thus set himself to defy both the law and the opinion of the great bulk of his subjects. His conduct was honestly courageous though not prudent. For the purpose of obtaining revenue it was necessary to convocate Parliament and James was lucky enough to get a Parliament which at first was as royalist as the Cavalier Parliament had been in its early days.



James II and his Queen




William III and Mary



Anne



Marlborough



JOHN MILTON
From the portrait by Faithorne

the Anglican Church now tried to make friends with the Protestant Nonconformists being largely guided by the advice of William Penn the Quaker. In April 1688 he reissued the Declaration of Indulgence and insisted that the bishops should order it to be read in the churches. When they refused he petitioned the king seven of them were prosecuted. They were put on trial and acquitted. The popular feeling was shown so strongly that the king gave way and withdrew many of the orders most disliked.

The Revolution, 1688-9—He was too late. Seven of the leading men of the kingdom determined to invite William Prince of Orange the son-in-law of James to come over and settle the affairs of England. The birth of a son to James at this time did not help the king because his angry subjects believed that a trick had been played and that the child was not genuine. The next heir of course was Mary the king's elder daughter and wife of the Prince of Orange who was a Protestant like her husband. He was a grandson of Charles I but not in a position to claim the crown for himself as next heir. William landed in the west of England in November 1688. James collected an army but being unable to obtain any real support was obliged to escape to France whence he never returned to England (December 23). In January 1689 an informal Convention met and declared the throne vacant. In February William and Mary accepted the crown of England as joint sovereigns. Thus quietly and without any disturbance or bloodshed the Revolution was effected so far as Great Britain was concerned. Ireland made more difficulty about transferring her allegiance.

Literature and Science—As we have seen the political record of the restored Stuarts is not pleasant or honourable and few if any of the statesmen of the time deserve much praise. Most of them on both sides at one time or another accepted French money. In literature and science however the period can boast of many honoured names. Lord Clarendon the minister of Charles II wrote a valuable history and



Sir Christopher Wren and St Paul's Cathedral

Plague	1665
Fire of London	1666
Peace of Breda; fall of Clarendon	1667
Triple Alliance	1668
Secret Treaty of Dover	1670
Second war with Holland	1672-4
Test Act	1673
Peace of Nimeguen	1678
Popish Plot	1678-81
Habeas Corpus Act	1679
The Oxford Short Parliament	1681
Rye House Plot	1683
Accession of James II, insurrections of Argyle and Monmouth, revocation of Edict of Nantes	1685
Publication of Newton's <i>Principia</i>	1687
Trial of the seven bishops, flight of James II	1688
Convention declared throne vacant	1689

BOOK V

FROM THE REVOLUTION TO THE DEATH OF QUEEN
VICTORIA, 1689-1901

CHAPTER XIX

WILLIAM III AND MARY II, ANNE, 1689-1714

Bill of Rights.—The Convention Parliament which, in February 1689, gave the crown of England to William and Mary, required the new sovereigns to accept a Declaration of Rights, reciting the acts of tyranny committed by James and claiming the ancient rights of the English people. Later in the year the Convention, having declared itself a regular Parliament, changed the Declaration into the Bill of Rights and passed it in the form of a statute or Act of Parliament, which, among other provisions, fixed the succession to the throne and affirmed that the king might neither levy taxes nor keep up a standing army without consent of Parliament; that he

had no power to suspend the execution of laws; that Parliament should be freely elected, meet frequently, and be allowed free speech, and that cruel and unusual punishments should not be inflicted. The passing of this statute made it clear to all men that the sceptre of an English king was to be held henceforth by reason of the goodwill of Parliament, not by divine right, and finally assured to Englishmen the liberties so often claimed in previous ages and so often violated by ambitious sovereigns. It closed the long struggle for power between the Crown and Parliament. But for a few years longer the House of Lords continued to be stronger than the House of Commons, which did not assert its supremacy until the reign of Anne. The struggle between the two Houses has continued to the present day.

Plots in England.—Queen Mary, who had no desire to stand on her rights as the daughter of the exiled king, left business in the hands of her husband William, although much worried by the strife of English political parties, definitely known by that time as Whigs and Tories, and threatened by intrigues to restore King James, was never obliged to draw the sword in order to hold England. Two plots against him, Preston's in 1690 and Sir John Fenwick's in 1696, were detected and the authors duly punished. Sir John Fenwick was the last person executed under an act of attainder (*ante* p. 186).

Rebellion in Scotland; Massacre of Glencoe.—But in both Ireland and Scotland the fruits of the Revolution had to be secured by hard fighting. The cause of James in Scotland was taken up by John Graham of Claverhouse, Viscount Dundee, who defeated King William's troops at Killiecrankie (June 1689). The victory was useless, because Dundee was killed in the fight and his army melted away at once. The Highlanders as a rule adhered to the Stuarts, and their efforts to bring them back lasted with interruptions until 1745. King William's Government offered a free pardon to the clans which should submit on or before the last day of 1691. Most of them came in but one small clan, the Macdonalds of Glencoe,

delayed too long. Their enemy the Master of Stair, having obtained an order from William authorizing him to 'extirpate that set of thieves', made use of it to attack the clan with shameful treachery, and killed thirty-eight of them. This affair is remembered as the Massacre of Glencoe (1692).

War in Ireland; Battle of the Boyne.—The resistance offered by Ireland was a much more serious matter. James II. passed over to Ireland from France, and soon found himself master of the whole island except the towns of Londonderry (*ante*, p. 178) and Enniskillen or Inniskilling, in the north. The successful defence of Londonderry for 105 days, from April to August 1689, is a famous incident in the war. The Irish chiefly desired to recover the lands confiscated by Cromwell (*ante*, p. 200) while James was thinking more of using Ireland as a base from which to operate against England with French help. A Parliament held in Dublin attainted nearly 2,500 leading Protestants by name including 23 ladies, and took steps to sweep away all the work of the English rulers for centuries past. William as soon as he could manage to do so, crossed over and landed at Carrickfergus, in the north-east of Ireland. Marching southwards towards Dublin, he found James and his army strongly posted on the opposite side of the river Boyne. William forced the passage of the river and drove James away in dishonoured flight to Dublin, whence he escaped again to France (July 1690).

The Penal Laws.—William's generals continued the war after the king had returned to England. It was ended by the surrender of Limerick in the south west (October 3, 1691). The English commander granted favourable terms. By the military treaty all officers and soldiers of the Irish army who desired to go to France were to be given the means of doing so. That arrangement was duly acted on. By the civil treaty the Irish were promised, subject to the approval of Parliament, restoration to the position they enjoyed in the reign of Charles II., their privileges including a certain amount of liberty of worship. King William was personally willing to abide

by his officers' agreement, but the bigotry of both the English and the Irish Parliaments would not allow him to do so. The Irish Parliament, which had been filled with Catholics by James, was now filled with Protestants bitterly hostile to their Catholic fellow countrymen and the English Parliament was similar in feeling. The result was that the conditional promises made at Limerick were overruled, and all persons in Ireland professing the Roman Catholic religion—that is to say, the large majority of the people—were subjected to cruel penal laws which threw all power, and, so far as possible, all property, into Protestant hands. This evil system had the one merit of keeping Ireland from rebellion for a hundred years. The Catholic population was held down by the Protestant minority and the English Government had nothing to fear from Ireland until the time of the French revolutionary war. The trade of Ireland except the linen trade of Belfast and the north (*ante*, p. 185) was grievously injured by laws made in the English interest.

Domestic Policy.—Before we turn to consider the foreign policy of William the subject foremost in his thoughts it will be convenient to notice the more important English domestic events of his reign which do not include the squabbings of party politicians. Those are dead and may well be buried.

The wrangling of the sects still continued to occupy too much of the attention of Englishmen but nevertheless a great change had come to pass. It is impossible to imagine the burning alive of a heretic in the England of William III and the mere statement of that fact is enough to show the progress made by ideas of liberty. The king's Government although it could not afford to ignore the quarrels of the Churches, was mainly concerned with the affairs of this world. William felt no difficulty in supporting the Anglican Church with its bishops in England while at the same time maintaining the privileges of the Presbyterian Church with its synods in Scotland. Such an attitude was impossible to either Charles I or James II, who conscientiously believed each in his own

Church. William, like all subsequent statesmen, governed England in the spirit of a man of the world, not in that of a theologian.

The Beginnings of the 'Cabinet'.—On the whole, he got on well with his Parliaments. He could not obtain all he wanted, and had to submit to rebuffs which he did not like, but by management he avoided any serious conflict. At first he tried to work with a mixture of Tory and Whig ministers, but at the close of 1694, acting on the advice of Lord Sunderland, he dismissed the Tories and filled their posts with Whigs, and so was able to command the services of a body of men agreeing generally in their views of public affairs. The most eminent of the four Whig ministers whom he chiefly consulted was Lord Somers. That 'Whig Junto', as it was called in the slang of the day, was the forerunner of the modern 'cabinet', an informal committee of the Privy Council dependent on the votes of a majority in the House of Commons. Power was now quickly passing from the hands of the king and the Lords into those of the Commons, but the transfer was not clearly visible until after William's death.

Finance ; Bank of England.—In the past the financial arrangements of an English Government had been of a very primitive, rough kind. No system of organized credit existed, and the king had always to rely on supplies of ready cash. If he borrowed money from the London goldsmiths or other rich people he was expected to repay the principal as well as the interest without much delay. Sometimes he failed to do so, but nobody ever supposed that the Government could simply go on paying the interest without being expected to repay the sum borrowed. This crude system came to an end in 1694, when the Bank of England was founded on the suggestion of a Scotchman named Paterson. The Bank arranged to lend a portion of the money deposited with it to the Crown, and not to ask for the principal so long as the interest should be regularly paid. Thus the modern system of a national debt was started, and William was supplied with funds for

the war with France. The old system continued in India for a century longer. Warren Hastings, not having the use of the modern system of credit, was obliged to raise cash, and so was driven to the dealings with Chait Singh and the Begams of Oudh, which have been so much blamed. The subject is too intricate for further discussion here, but the student should note that the modern system of finance dates in England from the time of William III.

Reform of the Coinage.—The king further showed his understanding of the principles of sound finance—the foundation of good government—by his reform of the currency. The coinage was in a bad state, the coins being worn and clipped, and so worth much less than their nominal value. In 1695 William raised by a special tax the sum of £1,200,000 to pay for the cost of a new honest coinage, and, by establishing five provincial mints, was able to complete the change in two years. Sir Isaac Newton (*ante* p. 224) was appointed Master of the Mint in 1697.

Standing Army; Mutiny Act.—In the time of King William it was impossible for the government to be carried on without the help of a permanent trained army. We have seen how such a force began to be kept in the days of Charles II. and how James II. increased it with the purpose of establishing his personal power (*ante*, p. 220). The nation consequently, was timid and frightened at the obligation of maintaining a standing army under strict discipline, though it could not deny the necessity. Parliament hit on the device of passing a Mutiny Act, authorizing courts martial, which had been forbidden by the Bill of Rights (*ante*, p. 225) but limiting the authority to six months only. This time was afterwards extended to a year (1689). Ever since then Parliament has kept the control of the army in its own hands by passing a Mutiny Act, or Army Act as it is now called each year. If that Act were not passed every year the army could not exist.

Toleration Act.—The Toleration Act passed in the same

exercised by the bishops. In the reigns of James I and Charles I strict control was maintained by the Star Chamber which inflicted cruel punishments on persons who printed matter disagreeable to the Government. After the Restoration a Licensing Act was passed (1662) which allowed printing presses to exist only at London, York and the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. Every work issued had to be approved by the Licensor. In 1695 the House of Commons refused to renew the Act and publishers and printers were surprised to find themselves free from official control. They continued of course to be subject to prosecution under the law of libel as they still are. In the reigns of William III and Anne the penalties imposed by the judges in libel cases were sometimes severe. Daniel Defoe the author of *Robinson Crusoe* for instance was condemned in 1702 to be fined, imprisoned and set in the pillory for writing a pamphlet offensive to the Government.¹ The withdrawal of the Licensing Act caused the foundation of many newspapers. The first daily newspaper the *Daily Courant* appeared in 1702. The earliest English newspaper the *Weekly News* had been issued in 1622. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries public opinion was influenced by separate pamphlets issued on particular occasions rather than by articles in newspapers.

William's Foreign Policy—We now turn to foreign affairs which chiefly occupied the mind of William who continued to be Stattholder or Governor of Holland as well as King of England and was thus in close touch with the politics of the Continent. The main object of his life was to curb the growing power of France under its ambitious King Louis XIV (1643-1715) commonly known as the Great Monarch (*Le Grand Monarque*) who had made France the leading state in Europe.

¹ The pillory was a wooden frame supported by an upright pillar or post and having holes through which the head and hands of the offender were fastened in an uncomfortable fashion for an hour or longer. If he was unpopular he was liable to be pelted with dirt by the mob. If he was popular he was garlanded with flowers. The punishment has not been used since 1837.

So long as Charles II and James II lived the influence of England was thrown in favour of France, owing to the corrupt servility of the Stuart kings and in opposition to the wishes of the English people. The accession of William III brought together the two Protestant states England and Holland, and united them in the task of setting bounds to the ambition of Louis XIV.

Louis XIV, War of the Palatinate—In 1684 Louis who had been left in possession of fortresses in the Spanish Netherlands (now Belgium) by the Peace of Nimeguen in 1678 (*ante* p 214) and had annexed Strassburg a strong city close to the Rhine in 1681 was at the height of his power. Its decline began in 1685 with the revocation of the Edict of Nantes and the consequent furious persecution of Protestants which drove 400 000 of her best citizens from France and enriched England Ireland and other countries under Protestant governments by receiving them. The government of Louis at that time was a pure despotism all checks on the royal authority having been removed. The French king's attack on the Palatinate along the Rhine in 1688 carried out with atrocious cruelty brought on a fresh war. Immediately after the accession of William and Mary war was declared between England and France (May 1689). Louis as we have seen did his best to deprive William of his English throne by helping James in Ireland but the battle of the Boyne (1690) and the surrender of Limerick (1691) foiled his efforts (*ante* p 227). In 1692 Admiral Russell commanding the combined English and Dutch fleets saved England from all fear of invasion by almost destroying the French fleet in the battle of La Hogue off the coast of Normandy.

On land William was less fortunate being defeated in several battles in the Netherlands and scoring only one success the capture of the important town of Namur a most gallant feat of arms.

Treaty of Ryswick.—The war had so exhausted France that in 1697 Louis was obliged to accept the Treaty of

year gave Protestant Dissenters liberty of worship in their own fashions, subject to certain restrictions, but no indulgence was shown to Roman Catholics whose public worship continued to be illegal

Act of Settlement.—Queen Mary, a good woman died of small pox in 1694, to the king's great grief 'Nobody but myself' he said, 'could know her goodness' She had no children Her sister Anne married to Prince George of Denmark, had borne many children but had lost them all save one, the young Duke of Gloucester He, too, died at the age of eleven in 1700 and it became necessary to settle who should succeed Anne James II died in the year following in France, passing on his rights or claims to his son called the Pretender by William's adherents but recognized as James III of England by the King of France The nation was resolved not to accept a Roman Catholic (Popish) sovereign while at the same time desirous to choose its head from the royal family Parliament, therefore passing over a dozen or so of nearer relatives because they were Roman Catholics (Papists) chose the Electress Sophia of Hanover and her issue as being the nearest Protestant relations of the Princess Anne, to succeed her Sophia was the daughter of Frederick the Elector Palatine, who had married Elizabeth daughter of James I and was a Protestant at least nominally The Act of 1700 giving her the reversion of the English throne and commonly called the Act of Settlement, bore the title of an 'Act for the further limitation of the crown and better securing the rights and liberties of the subject' That statute under which His Majesty, the present King Emperor holds his exalted position requires the Sovereign to be a member of the Church of England Some minor provisions of the Act were afterwards modified

Independence of the Judges.—One clause and in itself the most valuable, was afterwards strengthened by a law forbidding judges to be members of the House of Commons We have seen how the Tudors and Stuarts expected the judges to be the obedient servants of the Crown and to adapt

their decisions to the royal wishes. So long as the judges held office at the king's pleasure they could not be independent. The Act of Settlement decreed that they should hold office during good behaviour at fixed salaries, and that they could not be dismissed except after an address from both Houses of Parliament.¹ That enactment, still in force, gave the judges the needful independence and is the main cause of the high estimation in which the judges of the superior English courts have been so long held. The independence of the Indian High Courts is secured in practice by the fact that they are appointed not by the Government of India but by the Crown. Not being directly concerned with the Home Government, and being secure of their position in India they are practically as independent of the executive as are the English judges, who cannot be removed except after an address by both Houses of Parliament.

Indian Affairs—The East India Company continued to make slow progress in India. Calcutta was founded in 1690 by Job Charnock and the fort built a few years later was called Fort William in honour of the reigning king. The formation in 1698 of a rival company which offered the English Government a loan of two millions sterling for a charter, brought the original East India Company into grave difficulties which were partially settled in April 1702 by the formal union of the two companies just after the death of King William and just before the War of the Spanish Succession. But trouble still continued until 1708 when Lord Godolphin the Lord High Treasurer of England pronounced a carefully considered award which disposed of all disputes and united the companies in fact as well as in name. The award was confirmed by Parliament. The death of Aurangzeb in 1707 was followed by the break up of the Mughal Empire.

The Press.—In early times 'the right to license the publication of printed books and pamphlets was claimed and

¹ The reform did not extend to Ireland. Grattan's Parliament introduced it.

Ryswick, by which he recognized William as King of England, and gave up the conquests made since the Peace of Nimeguen. This was a splendid victory for King William's policy, and immense relief for all Europe, which was freed for a few years from its dread of France.

The Spanish Succession—But the rest from war did not last long. The King of Spain was ill, and the succession to his dominions was claimed by three parties, Louis XIV, the Germanic Emperor, and the Prince of Bavaria. William tried to arrange matters and preserve the balance of power between the different states of Europe by two partition treaties (1698, 1700) which were never acted on. In 1700 the King of Spain died after making a will in favour of the Duke of Anjou, grandson of Louis XIV, who at once asserted his relative's claim to the vast empire of Spain in Europe, America and Asia. This claim set nearly all Europe against France.

The Grand Alliance; Death of William III—In 1701, England, Holland or the Dutch Republic and the Germanic Empire, now beginning to be known as Austria, concluded the *Grand Alliance*, designed to prevent the union of Spain with France, and for other objects. Just then James II died, and Louis at once publicly recognized his son the 'Pretender', as King James III of England. That action roused the wrath of the English people. A new Parliament with a small Whig majority was elected, and promptly voted large supplies for the renewed war with France. King William had hoped to command his armies in person but he had been for a long time in bad health, and when he met with an accident, in March, was unable to stand the shock and died. The great achievement of his life was the bridling of the power of France. He did not live to see the full results of his labours on which the victories of Marlborough now to be related, were based.

Accession of Anne; Marlborough.—Anne was at once accepted as Queen of England under the Act of Settlement. She was a good, virtuous, dull woman, devotedly attached to the

Church of England Her husband Prince George of Denmark, still duller than she, was of no account ¹ The queen was greatly influenced by her friend Sarah, Countess of Marlborough, whose husband, John Churchill had done much to bring about the Revolution and had been rewarded with the earldom of Marlborough Although he had done good service in the French and Irish wars, he had corresponded with the exiled king and even betrayed English plans to the French William consequently had been obliged to dismiss him but the king knew Churchill's value as a general, and recommended him to Anne as the fittest person to command the English forces in the new war ² When war was declared early in 1702, Marlborough then fifty two years of age was appointed Commander in chief of the allied Dutch and English armies From that time until the end of 1710 he was the most influential man in Europe He became a duke late in 1702

War of the Spanish Succession, Blenheim — The great war which began in 1702 and continued until 1713 is known to historians as the War of the Spanish Succession The campaigns of 1702 and 1703 were devoted to securing the southern Dutch frontier against the French The French and Bavarians hoped to advance through Germany on Vienna the capital of the emperor, and so force him to come to terms Marlborough warmly supported by his friend Prince Eugene of Savoy, saw that it would be wise to attack the French in the east rather than in the Netherlands He therefore boldly marched across Wurtemberg and came up with the French at the village of Blenheim (Blindheim) in Bavaria on the Danube where he found them posted in a strong position ³ By masterly movements and hard fighting the allies utterly


¹ Charles II summed him up neatly 'I have tried him drunk and I have tried him sober and there is nothing in him.'

² *Pallmer* is reported to have said 'The Duke of Marlborough has the best talents for a general of any man in England but he is a vile man and I hate him, for though I can profit by treasons I cannot bear the traitor'

³ French and German writers name the battle Hochstädt after a town near

defeated the French and Bavarians, and saved Germany (August 13, 1704) The French lost, one way or another, nearly 40,000 men, all their tents and baggage, and a large

THE NETHERLANDS



proportion of their guns and regimental colours. The loss of Marlborough and Prince Eugène was about 12,000 killed and wounded. Lord Stanhope observes that 'the tidings of that battle broke the spell which had been cast over Europe

by the prosperous and haughty reign of Louis XIV. William in former years had done little more than arrest his advance and balance his successes. Marlborough was in truth the first to turn these successes to defeat.

Battle of Ramillies.—The next great battle was fought in the Netherlands, now Belgium, between Namur and Louvain, at Ramillies (1706). The opposing armies were nearly equal in strength, the French having about 60,000, and the allies about 62,000 men. The result was that the French were defeated with loss far greater than that of the allies, and that Louis lost the whole of the Spanish Netherlands except Mons and Namur.

Battle of Oudenarde.—In July 1708 Marlborough raised the siege of Oudenarde, a fortress on the Scheldt to the west of Brussels, by inflicting a severe defeat on the French, which led to the capture by the allies of the fortress of Lille.

Battle of Malplaquet.—The fourth, and most murderous of Marlborough's victories, was gained in 1709 at Malplaquet, now within the French frontier, where Marlborough and Prince Eugene with about 90,000 men met a slightly inferior force of the French. The slaughter was awful and the loss of the allies was much heavier than that of the enemy, but Marlborough gained possession of Mons.

Treaty of Utrecht.—The long continued wars, which had extended over a large part of Europe, had so utterly exhausted the resources of France in men and money, that for years before a treaty was actually made Louis was anxious to obtain peace. Ultimately, after tedious discussions, treaties were signed at Utrecht in Holland (April 11, New Style, 1713) which concluded peace between France on the one side and the allies on the other.

The war which had begun with the purpose of preventing the Duke of Anjou from becoming King of Spain, ended by his recognition as King under the title of Philip V. But portions of his territories were given to other powers, and England retained the impregnable fortress of Gibraltar at

the entrance of the Mediterranean, as well as the island of Minorca Gibraltar, which had been taken by surprise in 1704, is still one of the most important possessions of England. Minorca was given up long ago. The Pretender was required to leave France. In America England acquired from the French the valuable colonies of Nova Scotia and Newfoundland, with some other territories. The French navy having been destroyed at La Hogue (*ante*, p. 235), and the navies of Holland, Spain, and other powers having decayed, the English were left supreme at sea. England owes the empire of India to the supremacy at sea thus gained more than to any other cause. 'After the great settlement of Europe which was accomplished at the Peace of Utrecht, France and England alone faced each other as serious competitors for the prize of Indian commerce, having distanced or disabled all other candidates' (A. Lyall). The struggle for that prize began in 1745.

Home Politics.—Having thus sketched in outline the beginning, progress, and result of the war on the Continent, we turn to home affairs. The bickerings of Whigs and Tories and the intrigues with the Pretender, carried on by prudent politicians who thought it quite possible that the Stuarts might return, need not long detain our attention. The conduct of the French war which was regarded as a Whig policy, was hampered by Tory opposition. In 1708 the Whigs got the upper hand and forced on the unwilling queen a ministry wholly formed of members of that party. The foolish impeachment of a clergyman named Sacheverell for a sermon advocating the doctrine that resistance to the royal authority is wrong in any circumstances proved to be unpopular and gave the queen the opportunity in 1710 to form a ministry of her Tory friends in which Harley (Lord Oxford) and St. John (Lord Bolingbroke) were the most prominent members. In the following year (1711) the insolence of the duchess forced the queen to quarrel with the Duke of Marlborough, who was dismissed from all his offices.

Creation of Tory Peers —At that time although the House of

Commons was Tory and eager for peace, the House of Lords was Whig and anxious to continue the war Marlborough, who had joined the Whigs, was averse to peace The opposition of the Lords was overcome by the creation of twelve peers in the Tory interest (1711) No similar exercise of the royal power had ever occurred before or has occurred since The precedent is of special interest in the present year (1911) when a creation of peers on a much larger scale was threatened by the Liberal party, the successors of the Whigs The queen's action rendered the Treaty of Utrecht possible

A Bishop as Minister —The appointment of Dr Robinson, Bishop of Bristol, to be Lord Privy Seal in 1711 is interesting as being the last occasion on which an English bishop has been appointed to a political office Even at the time his nomination caused great surprise The bishop helped to negotiate the Treaty of Utrecht

The Queen in Parliament —No English sovereign of modern times would dream of attending a debate in Parliament. Queen Anne was several times present *incognito* that is to say, without ceremony, at debates of the House of Lords The first time she went in 1704 she is described by an eye witness as sitting 'at first on the throne and after it being cold on a bench at the fire She was also present at the trial of Dr Sacheverell

Union with Scotland —By far the most important domestic event of Anne's reign was the union with Scotland carried out in 1707 after years of discussion The union of the crowns in 1603 had not united the countries which continued to be separate with a tendency to be hostile Scotland had her own Parliament and was very jealous of her independence¹ The final union was due to the genius and patience of Lord Somers who had been the trusted adviser of William III. Questions of finance proved extremely difficult, Scotland at that time being a very poor country Lord Stanhope states

¹ The union of Parliaments partially effected by Cromwell (*ante*, p. 200) did not last

that it was computed that the total revenue of England came to £5,191,803, and that of Scotland to only £160,000. It was not easy to adjust the rights and debts of countries differing so widely in wealth, but by the skill of Lord Somers all obstacles were overcome.

Articles of Union.—The old trouble about the Churches was avoided by the Articles of Union frankly recognizing the Presbyterian Church as the national established Church of Scotland. England and Scotland became one kingdom under the name of Great Britain, with a national flag, the Union Jack, bearing the English cross of St George and the Scotch cross of St Andrew. The Scotch Parliament ceased to exist, Scotland being represented in the Parliament of Great Britain by 45 members of the House of Commons and 16 representative peers chosen by the peerage of Scotland. Other clauses settled financial and various minor matters. Scotland retained her special legal system based on Roman Law and quite different from that of England and Ireland. At the time, of course, many people in both countries were opposed to the Union, but the benefits of the measure to both England and Scotland are so apparent that for generations past not a voice has been raised against it. The queen, presiding at the solemn ceremony of giving her assent, said ‘I desire and expect from all my subjects of both nations that from henceforth they act with all possible respect and kindness to one another, so that it may appear to all the world they have hearts disposed to become one people. This will be a great pleasure to me.’ Her wish has been fulfilled.

Death of Anne.—The Treaty of Utrecht was the last considerable event of Anne’s reign. Her health began to fail in the year (1713) that the treaty was signed, and in August 1714 she died at the age of fifty, the last of the Stuart dynasty to reign in England. Lord Bolingbroke, who had become the queen’s chief minister, desired to bring in the Pretender, but his plans were upset by the unexpected death of the queen, who on her deathbed appointed a Whig duke, a supporter

of the Act of Settlement, to be Treasurer, and so secured the immediate quiet proclamation of George, Elector of Hanover, son of the Electress Sophia (*ante*, p. 232), as King George I of Great Britain.

Queen Anne's Virtues.—Queen Anne, although far from being clever, had a will of her own which she asserted on occasion. She had a sincere desire to do what was right and was absolutely free from all personal vices. The purity of life at her court was a change welcome to decent people after the shameless immorality of Charles II and the more veiled irregularities of James II and William III. Her honourable attitude towards her royal duties is simply expressed in a private letter asking for advice, first published by Lord Stanhope.

'Let me know the truth,' she writes. 'For God's sake tell me your mind freely, for I would not err in anything. Whenever I do, it will be my misfortune, but shall never be my fault, and as long as I live, it shall be my endeavour to make my country and my friends easy, and though those that come after me may be more capable of so great a trust as it has pleased God to put into my poor hands, I am sure they can never discharge it more faithfully than her that is sincerely your humble servant, A R.'

The similar sentiments expressed in grander style by Queen Elizabeth (*ante*, p. 160) may be compared. In many respects Queen Victoria much resembled Queen Anne.

Literature—The age of Anne is famous in the history of English literature, and, although modern taste does not take so much pleasure in the writings of that time as was felt by earlier generations, the high merit of much of the work then done cannot be denied. Most people can still read with delight the essays of Addison in the *Spectator*, and recognize the force and clearness of the style of Swift. His strange book, *Gulliver's Travels*, although written as a political satire, is enjoyed as a work of imagination by thousands who never think of the inner meaning of the story. It was the age in which the political pamphlet had powerful influence, so that the Whigs were as glad to use the graceful pen of

Addison as the Tories were to employ the savage satire of Swift. The polished verse of Pope, who produced some of his best work before Anne's death, is the finest of its kind. Most of the so-called poetry of her time and the greater part of the eighteenth century is too closely akin to prose to attract the readers of to-day, who expect from a poet more feeling than Pope and his countless imitators usually show. Few of the eighteenth-century 'poets' can now be read with enjoyment.

LEADING DATES

Accession of William III	Mutiny Act	Toleration Act	Battle of Killhecranke	1689
	siege of Londonderry	Bill of Rights		
Battle of the Boyne	foundation of Calcutta			1690
Surrender of Limerick	end of the Irish War			1691
Battle of La Hogue				1692
Foundation of Bank of England	death of Queen Mary			1694
Liberty of the press				1695
Treaty of Pyswick				1697
Rival East India Company				1698
Act of Settlement	Death of James II	the Grand Alliance		1701
Accession of Anne	formal union of the East India Companies			
	beginning of War of Spanish Succession			1702
Battle of Blenheim				1704
Battle of Ramillies				1706
Union with Scotland				1707
Battle of Oudenarde	final union of East India Companies			1708
Battle of Malplaquet				1709
Creation of Tory peers				1711
Treaty of Utrecht				1713
Death of Anne			August	1714

CHAPTER XX

THE HANOVERIAN DYNASTY GEORGE I AND GEORGE II. 1714-60

Accession of George I.—The new king, an elderly German prince, fifty-four years of age, had never before been in England and could not speak a word of English. He had

received little education and possessed no claims to personal affection or respect. He was accepted by the Privy Council chiefly in order to keep popery out. If the Whig dukes had not been too quick for Bolingbroke at the moment of the queen's death, the Pretender probably would have been summoned to ascend the throne as James III with the approval of nearly all Scotland and Ireland and a large part of England. The south western counties were strongly Jacobite, as the adherents of the Stuarts were called¹. But once King George had been proclaimed nobody was ready to start a civil war in order to turn him out, and so he and his descendants remained in possession.

A Whig Ministry.—George, who would have nothing to do with men of the Tory party, whom he regarded as being all Jacobites, chose his ministers from among the Whigs only. Lord Bolingbroke and the Duke of Ormond fled to France and were attainted. Lord Oxford (Harley) was sent to the Tower. Lord Townshend became the principal minister.

End of the King's Personal Rule.—Up to Anne's time the sovereign had been in the habit of presiding over the meetings of his ministers and taking counsel with them. King George, being unable to speak or understand English, ceased to attend the meetings of the ministers, and none of his successors has ever revived the old practice. The change is to be noted as involving the end of the sovereign's personal rule, and the beginning of the modern system of government. Ever since the time of George I ministers have met at times and places convenient to themselves, not in obedience to a royal command. The ministry (meaning by that term the principal ministers, at present about twenty in number, now called the Cabinet) usually has been composed of men belonging to a single party and in general agreement on the larger questions of policy, looking for support to a majority of the members of the House of Commons rather than to the favour of the

¹ *Jacobus* is the Latin form of James. Jacob and the Arabic *Yakub* are other forms of the name.

king The change of attitude of ministers was not fully completed until a later date The attempt made by George III to carry on personal government through ministers chosen by himself and by the help of a party of the 'king's friends' in the House of Commons produced results so disastrous that no other sovereign has cared to repeat it Even George III did not preside at meetings of his Cabinet¹

Jacobite Rising of 1715—In the autumn of 1715 the Earl of Mar in Scotland and certain gentlemen in the north of England took up arms in favour of James Edward, known to his friends as James III and to his enemies as the Old Pretender The insurrection was planned so badly and managed so feebly that it was easily suppressed without serious fighting About forty persons including two Scottish noblemen were executed and the Pretender, who had landed in Scotland escaped to France

The Septennial Act—The Long Parliament had passed during its first session (February 1641) an Act directing that Parliament should meet at least once in three years, even though not summoned by the king The purpose of that statute was to prevent the king from governing without a Parliament as Charles I had done for so many years After the Restoration that law was repealed as being contrary to the king's just rights but the provision that the sitting and holding of Parliaments should not be interrupted for more than three years was retained In 1694 a statute was enacted decreeing that no Parliament should continue to sit for more than three years from the time of the general election The purpose of that statute was to restrain a Parliament once elected from continuing its sittings for an indefinite number

¹ The sovereign still presides at occasional formal meetings of the Privy Council, when a few members are summoned to pass an Order in Council issued in compliance with a statute Such meetings are purely formal. All Cabinet ministers are members of the Privy Council, which consists of about 250 councillors A full meeting of the Council is never summoned except at the opening of a new reign or on such an occasion as the sovereign's approaching marriage

of years, like the Long Parliament of Charles I and the Cavalier Parliament of Charles II. The Acts of 1641 and 1694, although so different in intention and effect, have both become known as Triennial or Three-yearly Acts.

In 1716 the Whig Government of George I felt that popular elections would be dangerous while the position of the new dynasty was still insecure. In that year, accordingly, an Act known as the Septennial or Seven yearly Act was passed, providing that the Parliament then sitting and each succeeding Parliament might continue to exist for seven years but no longer¹. That Act has remained in force until the present year, 1911, when the duration of a Parliament has been reduced to five years.

The 'South Sea Bubble'.—The South Sea Company, formed in 1711 for trading in the South Seas, chiefly with the Spanish colonies, which were supposed to be full of untold riches, was tempted by the example of the French Mississippi Company to extend its operations and make to the English Government offers to pay off the National Debt (*ante*, p. 230), which at that time exceeded 36 millions sterling². The project caught the fancy of the nation so that all classes began to gamble in the Company's shares which ran up to a price nine or ten times their nominal value. Crowds of other companies formed for all sorts of absurd purposes were started by rogues, and people went mad trying to make money quickly. Something similar happened in Bombay during the years 1861-5, when the American War of Secession caused a sudden demand for Indian cotton. Several of the ministers of George I took part

¹ Much objection was taken because a Parliament elected for three years only extended its own life to seven years. Necessity alone could justify such a measure.

² In 1910 the 'funded' debt, which the Government is not bound to pay off at any fixed time, was 615 millions of pounds in round numbers. Several millions are paid off every year from a 'sinking fund'. A large part at least a fourth of the existing debt is due to the South African War. In 1720 people thought 36 millions a terrible burden. Most of the later debt was incurred during the prolonged French wars.

in the rash and dishonest gambling of 1720 and came to grief, as did thousands of other speculators. When the price of the Company's shares suddenly fell from 1,000 to 175 in the month of September Government was obliged to interfere and to remit seven millions sterling due by the Company. The incident is often described as the 'South Sea Bubble', because the scheme burst like a pricked bubble.

Sir Robert Walpole—The necessary measures for repairing so far as possible the South Sea disaster were carried out by Lord Townshend's brother in law, Sir Robert Walpole, a politician who had been coming into notice for some years past. He was the only statesman of that time who understood money matters, and is reckoned the first of the series of English finance ministers. He came into power in 1721 and practically ruled the country for twenty-one years until 1742.

The 'Drapier's Letters'.—Ireland, as we have seen (*ante*, p. 228), was held down by cruel penal laws which deprived the Roman Catholic majority of the people of all influence, and left power solely in the hands of the Protestant minority who supported the English Whig ministry. We hear little about the country in the histories of those days. A contract given to an Englishman named Wood to supply Ireland with copper halfpence and farthings is remembered because of the stir caused by pamphlets entitled the *Drapier's Letters* (1724) written by Dean Swift, who attacked the arrangement as an insult to Ireland. The coins denounced falsely as worthless, were really quite good though rather small. They gave Swift an opportunity of showing off his cleverness as a writer with small regard for the facts.

Impeachment of Lord Chancellor Macclesfield—Another domestic event deserves notice the impeachment (1725) of the Earl of Macclesfield Lord Chancellor, for corruption and misuse of Chancery funds. Like his great predecessor, Lord Bacon, he was unable to make any serious defence. He was sentenced to pay a fine of £30,000, but by the king's favour no further penalty was exacted, and a small portion

of the fine was repaid. The next impeachment was that of Warren Hastings (1788-94). The only later occasion on which the process of impeachment has been used was the trial in 1806 of Lord Melville, who was acquitted. It is not likely that anybody will be impeached in the future.

Foreign Affairs.—The fact that King George was a German ruling prince as well as king of England made it difficult for his English Government to keep out of the quarrels of the continental states. When Louis XIV of France died in 1715 his heir was his great grandson, a delicate infant, who was proclaimed as Louis XV. The young king's uncle, the Regent, Duke of Orleans, dropped the Stuart cause and made friends with England, supported by Holland and Austria. An attempt made by Spain to break the terms of the Treaty of Utrecht was foiled by the destruction of one Spanish fleet in an action off the coast of Sicily (1718), and the wreck of another fleet sent to support a projected Jacobite rising in Scotland (1719). After the death of the Duke of Orleans, his policy of friendship with England was continued by Cardinal Fleury.

The 'Opposition'.—Sir Robert Walpole always did his best to keep the peace and avoid war, for which his opponents often clamoured. The institution of a permanent party 'opposition', striving to drive the ministry from power and take its place, dates from the reign of George I. William Pulteney, afterwards Earl of Bath, who had reason to dislike Walpole, is reckoned as the first 'Leader of the Opposition', occupying a position similar to that now held (1911) by Mr Bonar Law in relation to Mr Asquith's Government.

George I died suddenly while on a visit to Hanover (June 1727).

Accession of George II; Walpole's Policy.—The Prince of Wales, who had long been on bad terms with his father, as was the custom in the family, succeeded him as George II. He had the advantage of being able to speak and understand English. At first he tried to get rid of Walpole, but found

that he could not do without him Walpole accordingly, remained in power, with strong support from the queen, Caroline of Anspach, specially devoting himself to the task of keeping England out of the quarrels of the states on the continent He 'loved power so much that he would not endure a rival', and therefore drove from office the ablest men among the politicians of his time—Pulteney, Carteret, Chesterfield and others Under his care the trade of England increased and the riches of the country grew rapidly The towns of the north Liverpool Manchester and others now began to show promise of their present greatness At that time the leading Whig noblemen possessed excessive influence, and in many cases were able to return whom they liked as members of the House of Commons Walpole felt no scruples about maintaining his influence over the House so formed by giving away offices of profit and even by direct cash bribery His peaceful though corrupt, government had the merits of avoiding war, allowing the new dynasty to settle down and giving the country free scope to grow rich

Failure of the Excise Bill—In 1733 Walpole, who as already observed understood financial or money matters much better than any politician of his time tried to improve the system of taxation by substituting excise duties levied on goods after entry into the country or after manufacture for customs duties levied at the ports His proposals though *sensible*, excited so much opposition that he had to withdraw them A minor reform—the use of English instead of Latin in law proceedings—was effected in 1731

Resignation of Walpole, Beginning of War Period—In 1737 the death of the queen deprived Walpole of her valuable support and two years later, much against his will and his conscience he was dragged into an unjust war with Spain due to disputes about trade The war was unsuccessful and the influence of Walpole gradually declined until in 1742 he was obliged to resign office to which he had clung too long and accept a peerage as Earl of Orford Thus ended the

first, or peace period of the reign of George II. Thereafter, England, except for short intervals, was constantly at war, usually with France, and often with other powers as well, until the Napoleonic struggle came to an end in 1815. During that long series of wars the empire of British India was formed.

War of the Austrian Succession ; Dettingen and Fontenoy.—The death of the Emperor of Austria or Germanic Emperor without a male heir was the cause of a general war. By an instrument known as a ' Pragmatic Sanction ' or ' Rescript '—an ancient Byzantine term—the deceased emperor had willed that his daughter, the Archduchess Maria Theresa, should succeed to his dominions. But this arrangement, not being agreeable to other powers, brought on war. Frederick the Great, King of Prussia, seized the larger portion of the province of Silesia, and both France and England were drawn into the conflict. Although the formal declaration of war between the two countries did not come until 1744, English troops, headed by King George in person, helped to beat the French at Dettingen in Bavaria in June 1743. This is the last occasion on which an English king has commanded troops in the field. In another hard fought battle at Fontenoy in Belgium (1745) the English and their allies were defeated by the French, whose victory was largely due to the bravery of the Irish Brigade, descendants of Jacobite exiles from Ireland.

Jacobite Rising of 1745 ; Culloden—In the same year (1745) the last rising in favour of the Stuarts took place. Prince Charles Edward, known as the Young Pretender, grandson of James II, landed in Scotland and quickly collected a large force from the Highland clans. He occupied Edinburgh, defeated a small English army at Prestonpans near that city, and advanced into the middle of England, with seemingly good prospects of winning back his grandfather's throne for his father. But the English support obtained was so small that he dared not attempt to occupy London. He was

persuaded by timid advisers to turn back from Derby, and so to throw away his chances, whatever they were. A small success gained at Falkirk between Edinburgh and Glasgow did not help him. At Culloden, near Inverness in the north of Scotland, he was utterly and finally defeated by the Duke of Cumberland, second son of the King (1746). That victory put an end to the Stuart claim to the crown, and secured the Hanoverian dynasty in possession. Prince Charles Edward escaped to France after five months' wandering in disguise, during which he met with many adventures. In later life he became a confirmed drunkard, and died at Rome a dishonoured old man in 1788. The male line of the family was extinguished in 1807 by the death of the Young Pretender's brother Henry, who had become a cardinal, and was called Henry IX by his friends. The Stuarts are now represented by numerous descendants of Henrietta, youngest daughter of Charles I, who include the King of Italy.

Events of the War in India.—The war of the Austrian Succession extended to the French and English settlements in India with results of some importance. The details of the fighting in the Carnatic and along the Madras or Coromandel (*Chola mandala*) coast belong to Indian rather than to English history. In this place we shall merely mention the principal incidents. Both French and English fleets appeared in Indian waters. Madras being unable to resist the French fleet under de la Bourdonnais was obliged to surrender (September 10, 1746) on terms which were disallowed by Dupleix, Governor of Pondicherry, a bitter enemy of the English. The possessions of the East India Company were then restricted to the small settlement of Fort St David, which managed to hold out. After peace had been made in Europe Madras was restored to the Company (August 21, 1749).

Peace of Aix la Chapelle.—The general war was ended by the Peace of Aix la-Chapelle (1748).¹ The Young Pretender

¹ Aix la-Chapelle is the French name of the city of Aachen in Rhenish Prussia, where Charlemagne is buried.

was expelled from France and the title of George II was recognized. The King of Prussia was allowed to retain Silesia. In many parts of the world conquests made during the war were restored, Madras being one of them. The treaty resulted in the breach of the alliance between Austria and England.

Unofficial War in India; Defence of Arcot by Clive.—Although the Peace of Aix la Chapelle was so far observed in India that Madras was restored to the East India Company, fighting went on between the French and English in the south, because the French supported Chandr Sahib as Nawab of the Carnatic and Muzaffar Jang as Nizam while the rival claimants, Muhammed Ali and Nasir Jang respectively, were backed by the English. During that irregular, unofficial warfare Robert Clive gave proof of his ability as a general, and won undying fame by his heroic defence of Arcot (1751). The English home Government having complained that it was wrong for war to go on in India while the Kings of France and England were at peace the French Government recalled Dupleix, who was ruined and left to die in poverty. The general result was that the English got control over the Carnatic, or Madras coast while the French retained their influence in the Nizam's dominions. Peace did not last long.

Old and New Style—Before we enter on the story of the political changes and wars which followed the Peace of Aix la Chapelle certain events of a peaceful kind require notice.

All nations, including the Indians have found a difficulty in making the calendar year agree with the actual movement of the earth round the sun, and so with the seasons. The period of revolution of the earth round the sun, although nearly $365\frac{1}{4}$ days, is something less. The quarter of a day is easily arranged for roughly by adding a day to the year once every four years, but the small difference between $365\frac{1}{4}$ days and the true period of revolution has to be corrected in other ways. If it is neglected the error grows into something large in the course of ages. A Pope in the sixteenth

century made the necessary correction, which was accepted gradually by the Catholic States. But most of the Protestant Governments were slow to accept from the Pope even the correction of the calendar. In the middle of the eighteenth century the error in the English year had grown to eleven days, enough to be inconvenient in practice. Parliament accordingly passed an Act in 1751 decreeing that in 1752 the day following September 2 should be called September 14. Thus 11 days were dropped out of the reckoning, and ignorant people were angry because they fancied that the Government had shortened their lives by so many days. The corrected reckoning is called the New Style, dates according to the old reckoning being said to be in the Old Style. At the same time Parliament ordered that the year should begin on January 1, not on March 25, as had been the custom previously. Nearly three months were thus cut off from 1751, which had begun on March 25. The year 1752 began on January 1. Historians have to bear these matters carefully in mind, for if they neglect to do so, their dates may sometimes be a year wrong¹. The Russians and other nations attached to the Greek Church still follow the Old Style, so that their reckoning is now more than 12 days in error.

Religious Revival; Wesley and the Methodists—In the time of George II the religious zeal of both the Church of England and the Dissenters had died away. Most of the clergy had become careless and the people generally seemed to feel little interest in religion. A small body of Oxford men led by the brothers Wesley and George Whitfield, being distressed at the want of spiritual life and the ignorance and immorality prevailing in the country, set themselves the task of beginning a new Reformation, and effected a great deal of good by earnest preaching and setting the example of saintly lives. The results of their teaching which roused the conscience of the nation and recalled the thoughts of the people

¹ E.g. March 24 1751 of the Old Style belongs to the year 1752 according to the New Style. Such dates are sometimes written March 24 $\frac{1751}{1752}$



LORD CLIVE

to things divine, are felt to this day. Gradually the followers of the new methods of presenting old doctrines formed themselves into separate sects or organized churches called Wesleyans, Methodists, and by other names, which now number millions of members in both Europe and America, as well as in other parts of the world. Many of the Christian Missions in India are managed by the Wesleyan and Methodist Churches. A good account of the growth and effects of the Wesleyan movement will be found in *Green's Short History of the English People*.

The Pelham Ministry.—For some years after the peace of Aix la Chapelle, the English Government was chiefly in the hands of two influential Whig magnates, Henry Pelham and his brother the Duke of Newcastle. Henry Pelham, who like Walpole, was skilled in financial business, succeeded in saving the country half a million a year by reducing the interest on the National Debt from 4 to 3 per cent. When he died in 1754 his brother, the Duke of Newcastle, a feeble, incompetent person, took his place.

Fighting between French and English in America.—About the same time the English settlers in America, then organized as thirteen separate colonies, began fighting with the French, who sought to prevent the English from spreading westwards across the Alleghany Mountains into the rich plains watered by the Ohio and Mississippi rivers. In America, as in India, the colonists started war on their own account, while France and England were officially at peace.

Beginning of the Seven Years' War.—That local quarrel over obscure forts in North America quickly became part of a gigantic struggle between France allied with Russia, Sweden, and most of the German states on the one side and England allied with Prussia on the other. The war in Europe was brought about by the anger of the Empress Maria Theresa at the Prussian seizure of Silesia, and the dislike for Frederick the Great of Prussia felt by the rulers of Russia and France. England, although ill prepared for war and governed by a

weak minister, felt bound to help Prussia. War between England and France was declared formally in the spring of 1756. The conflict thus begun is known to historians as the Seven Years' War, and had most important consequences for the growth of the British Empire in both Asia and America. Macaulay justly calls it 'the most glorious war in which England had ever been engaged', but it began ill.

Loss of Minorca.—Minorca, the island in the Mediterranean ceded by Spain under the Treaty of Utrecht (*ante*, p. 240), was then of importance for the same reason that Malta is now valuable, as a harbour and base for the Mediterranean fleet. But it was weakly garrisoned and was obliged to surrender to the French when Admiral Byng, who had been sent to relieve it, refused to fight. He was afterwards tried by court-martial and shot for his want of enterprise.

Loss of Calcutta.—In the month (June 1756) in which Minorca fell the English in India suffered a calamity owing to the capture of Calcutta by the Subadar or Nawab of Bengal, Siraj ud-daula. The story of the misconduct of the Governor of Calcutta and the horrors of the 'Black Hole' belongs to the history of India and need not be told here. The French gained some small successes in America, so that altogether the war had opened badly for the English. Although at that time public opinion had not the means of making itself heard which it has now, the popular feeling against the Government was sufficiently strong and plainly expressed in November 1756 to force the Duke of Newcastle to resign office and make way for a better man, under whose guidance the honour of the British name was redeemed by a long series of victories, and the foundations of the existing British empire beyond the seas were securely laid.

William Pitt the Elder.—The better man who then came forward to save his country was William Pitt, grandson of a former Governor of Madras. He had entered Parliament as a member for the 'rotten borough' of Old Sarum, and had distinguished himself as a bitter opponent of Sir Robert

Walpole When the Duke of Newcastle resigned in November 1756, Pitt became Secretary of State, the Duke of Devonshire being nominally his chief. But the king who disliked Pitt's imperious ways, soon turned him out of office. Next year, however, after an interval of eleven weeks during which England was without a ministry, George was compelled to bow before the expression of opinion from London and the great towns which strongly supported Pitt, and to accept an arrangement by which Newcastle retained the patronage of the Government, while Pitt took the lead in the House of Commons and managed the war and foreign affairs.

Reconquest of Calcutta; Plassey.—Although at first even Pitt's energy and strong will failed to command success in France and Germany, the failure was balanced by success in Asia. Clive and Admiral Watson recovered Calcutta just a year after it had been lost, and the victory of Plassey (June 23, 1757) made the English masters of Bengal. Later in the same year Frederick the Great of Prussia won two victories (Rossbach and Leuthen) over the Austrians and so was able to hold his own. He was helped with abundant supplies of money sent by Pitt, and enjoyed the services of a capable general Prince Ferdinand of Brunswick, a distant cousin.

Fighting in America; Naval Victory at Lagos Bay.—The needs of the colonies in America were not forgotten. Admiral Boscawen took Louisbourg then the capital of the island of Cape Breton, in 1758, and next year defeated a French fleet at Lagos Bay on the Portuguese coast, thus weakening the French power at sea, on which their ability to hold Canada depended. Fort Duquesne, where the fighting between the colonists had begun was taken by the colonial militia, with the result that Canada was cut off from Louisiana the distant southern French colony¹. The name of the fort was changed to Pittsburg in honour of the minister who knew how to organize victory.

¹ Louisiana was sold by Napoleon to the United States in 1803 for £2,400,000 (60 millions of francs). Louisbourg is now a fishing village.

Naval Victory in Quiberon Bay.—The year 1759 has been called the 'year of victories' The naval success of Admiral Boscawen at Lagos Bay, already mentioned, was followed by an equally decisive defeat of another French fleet in Quiberon Bay, on the coast of Brittany, by Admiral Hawke Those two battles almost destroyed the French navy, and in themselves decided the fate of the French settlements in both India and America, which could not be defended by a nation weak at sea

Battle of Minden.—In the same eventful year King Frederick's general, Prince Ferdinand, with the help of seven English regiments, defeated the French at Minden in Westphalia The defeat would have been overwhelming if Lord George Sackville, commanding the cavalry, had obeyed clear orders and pursued the beaten enemy But for some reason or other, probably ill temper, he failed in his duty and threw away half of the fruits of the victory

Conquest of Canada.—However dim may be the memory of Louisbourg, Quiberon Bay, and Minden, even the English schoolboy—a much more ignorant person than Macaulay supposed him to be—usually knows something of the daring capture of the Heights of Abraham at Quebec by Wolfe, the young general who owed his promotion to Pitt's discernment Both Wolfe and his gallant French opponent, the Marquis de Montcalm, fell in the fight which made Quebec an English province (1759) In the next year the conquest of Canada was completed The victors' gain was greater than they knew The Dominion of Canada, a mighty federation of self governing states, linked to the British Crown only by ties of loyalty, now stretches from ocean to ocean and promises to become at no distant date the equal rival of the United States of America

Final Defeat of the French in India—In India Sir Eyre Coote was as successful on the Madras coast as Clive had been in Bengal In January 1760 he utterly defeated the French general, Lally, at Wandiwash in the North Arcot District, and drove the enemy to take refuge in Pondicherry, which was invested both by sea and land in May 1760 The garrison,

having endured for nine months the pangs of starvation, was forced to surrender just a year after the battle of Wandiwash. Those events ended for ever the French hopes of founding an Indian empire in the south (1761). The destruction of the Maratha army in the same year at Panipat freed the rising English power for a time from the fear of its most formidable foe. Three years later the battle of Buxar (1764) secured the British hold over Bihār as well as Bengal.

Death of George II—Meantime the crown of England had passed from George II who died in October 1760 at the age of seventy-seven to his grandson who became king under the title of George III. Frederick Prince of Wales the eldest son of George II and a person of no account had died some years before his father.

LEADING DATES

Accession of George I	1714
Jacobite rising of the Pretender death of Louis XIV	1715
The Septennial Act	1716
The South Sea Bubble	1720
Sir Robert Walpole Prime Minister	1721
Accession of George II	1727
The Excise Bill	1733
Death of the queen	1737
War with Spain	1739
Beginning of war of the Austrian Succession	1740
Resignation of Walpole	1742
Battle of Dettingen	1743
Battle of Fontenoy Jacobite rising of the Young Pretender	1745
Battle of Culloden Surrender of Madras	1746
Peace of Aix la Chapelle or Aachen	1748
Unofficial war in India Clive's defence of Arcot	1751
Introduction of the New Style	1752
Beginning of the Seven Years War loss of Minorca and Calcutta	1756
Ministry of Pitt and Newcastle battle of Plassey	1757
Capture of Louisbourg	1758
Battle of Minden naval victories of Lagos Bay and Quiberon Bay capture of Quebec by Wolfe	1759
Battle of Wandiwash	1760
Death of George II	Oct 1760

CHAPTER XXI

THE REIGN OF GEORGE III TO THE FRENCH REVOLUTION,
1760-89

Accession of George III.—The accession of the new king was not merely the substitution of one George for another. It was an event of high importance involving weighty consequences. George III, a young man twenty two years of age, was a 'true born Englishman', trained in English habits and full of English prejudices. As a native of the country and third sovereign of his dynasty he was in a position to claim and obtain the personal loyalty of his subjects, which could not be given to merely German Electors of Hanover. The hopes of the Stuarts having been finally quenched at Culloden, the English people, Whigs and Tories, Catholics and Protestants, were willing and ready to support a young monarch who could now stand forth as the hereditary king, firmly established on his throne by the will of Providence and the assent of the nation. The Jacobite preferences of the Tories became a harmless sentiment and no longer formed an active influence in politics. Even the most Jacobite Tory found it possible to be the loyal and devoted subject of a youthful sovereign who was a hearty adherent of the Anglican Church and did not love the Whigs. The personal character of George III was beyond reproach. He was quite free from the sensual vices of his predecessors and set a good example to all classes by his strictly moral life.

Policy of George III.—George III began his reign with the deliberate purpose of asserting his power as king and freeing himself from bondage to the great Whig landowners who followed the Duke of Newcastle. He was not foolish enough to suppose that he could rule without a parliament, and therefore did not attempt to follow Stuart precedents, but rather reverted to the policy of Henry VIII and Elizabeth, seeking to exercise personal power through parliament, not against

its will. He devoted his energies to securing a majority of the 'King's friends' in Parliament, especially in the House of Commons, and fought hard for the principle that ministers should regard themselves as the servants of the king, liable to be dismissed at his pleasure. He succeeded to a considerable extent for some years, and if he had been an abler man than he was, might perhaps, have given new life to the royal authority. But he had not brains sufficient to justify him in undertaking to govern the empire in person.

The Elder Pitt in his Glory—Macaulay well describes the position which Pitt had gained by the 'year of victories'

'The situation which Pitt occupied at the close of the reign of George the Second was the most enviable ever occupied by any public man in English history. He had conciliated the King—he domineered over the House of Commons, he was adored by the people—he was admired by all Europe. He was the first Englishman of his time, and he had made England the first country in the world. The Great Commoner, the name by which he was often designated, might look down with scorn on coronets and garters.¹ The nation was drunk with joy and pride. The Parliament was as quiet as it had been under Pelham. Whigs and Tories, Churchmen and Puritans, spoke with equal reverence of the constitution and with equal enthusiasm of the talents, virtues and services of the minister.'

Resignation of Pitt—Powerful as the great minister was, the frown of the young king was enough to undo him. George preferred to give his confidence to the Earl of Bute—a Scotch nobleman formerly employed in Prince Frederick's household, and longed to free himself from the control of the councillor who relied for support on the nation rather than the monarch. Within a year after the accession of George III Pitt was compelled to resign and make way for the royal favourite.

¹ 'Commoner' as distinguished from a peer or lord. 'Coronets,' worn by peers on state occasions. The 'garter' is the badge of the Most Noble Order of the Garter—instituted by Edward III in the fourteenth century. The decoration of a Knight of the Garter (K.G.) is more esteemed than any other.



GEORGE III

From the portrait in the National Portrait Gallery.

Pitt, who knew that the kings of France and Spain had formed a secret Family Compact against England, desired to declare war against Spain at once and to continue the fight until the enemies of his country should be finally humbled. King George, on the other hand, desired peace and release from the domination of a minister too strong for him. For the moment the king succeeded in his purpose.

End of the Seven Years' War; Treaty of Paris.—Before the end of 1762 the terms of peace had been arranged, and early in the following year (1763) the Treaty of Paris was signed, and the Seven Years' War came to an end. France gave up Canada and her other possessions in North America, as well as certain West Indian islands and a settlement on the west coast of Africa. She also agreed not to maintain garrisons in Pondicherry and other Indian factories which were restored to her. Spain ceded Florida in North America, receiving back in exchange Havana in the island of Cuba and Manila in the Philippines which had been taken by English fleets towards the close of the war. There were also other provisions of minor importance. The King of Prussia was meanly left to shift for himself.

Resignation of Lord Bute—The treaty although it assured large gains to England was extremely unpopular, the nation being convinced that Pitt could have obtained better terms. Lord Bute yielded to the fierce attacks made on him and resigned office in April 1763.

Grenville's Ministry.—The king was obliged unwillingly to turn to the Whig leaders in order to form a ministry. He chose as Prime Minister Pitt's brother-in-law, George Grenville, a narrow-minded man, disposed to try and beat down opposition by harsh and arbitrary means. In fact, he seems to have been like Strafford the minister of Charles I in temper, though far from being his equal in ability. Grenville's administration is chiefly remembered for two things: the prosecution of John Wilkes a member of the House of Commons, for his writings and the Stamp Act, designed to raise about

£100 000 a year from the American colonies for the support of the army employed in their defence

John Wilkes—Wilkes was arrested under a 'general warrant' issued for the seizure of the authors, printers and publishers of No 45 of a newspaper called the *North Briton*. He was convicted of libel expelled from the House of Commons and compelled to retire to France. But the courts held that 'general warrants' failing to specify the name of any particular person to be arrested were illegal and thus the cause of English freedom gained something from the proceedings. In later years the House of Commons tried to keep Wilkes out of the House after he had been duly elected and to prevent the publication of the debates in the House. In the end Wilkes won his case on all points. He had been supported by public meetings and may be credited with having been the first to teach the nation the use and value of the public meeting. On the whole although he was a man of immoral life and disreputable character he did good service to his country. The persecution of Wilkes by George Grenville and his successors which was fully approved by the king made George III unpopular.

The Stamp Act of 1764—The Stamp Act of 1764 asserted the claim of the British House of Commons to the right of taxing the colonies. Although the Government could make out a good case for its action the resistance of the colonies to being taxed by a Parliament in which they had no members could also be justified in argument. It began the struggle which ended in the formation of the United States of America as an independent nation. The king and Grenville who were quite ready to use soldiers to compel acceptance of their laws by the colonists showed excessive obstinacy in pressing alleged rights which they were not in a position to enforce.

The Rockingham Ministry—Grenville and his colleague, the Duke of Bedford made themselves so disagreeable to the king that George dismissed them from office and appointed the Marquess of Rockingham as head of the Government.

Pitt although he refused to take office helped Rockingham, much against the king's will to repeal the Stamp Act (1766). The repeal was supported by Edmund Burke the famous Irish orator who had recently become a member of Parliament.

Pitt made Earl of Chatham—At last, in July 1766 the king persuaded Pitt to resume office as Prime Minister at the same time making him a peer by the title of Earl of Chatham. The acceptance of a peerage by the Great Commoner was extremely unpopular. The minister's mind soon gave way, and although he did not resign at once, the control of affairs passed into the hands of lesser men.

The King's Policy—Chatham resigned in 1768 and recovered his health but did not again take office. He defended Wilkes in his struggle against the House of Commons and the king (*ante* p. 260) and died in 1778 overcome by the effort of making his last speech in the House of Lords. George III after Chatham's retirement persisted in his attempt to govern the country through ministers chosen by himself who would do whatever he told them. In 1770 he appointed Lord North who accepted the king's views about the principles of government and the treatment of the colonies to be First Lord of the Treasury and Prime Minister.

Lord North Prime Minister—Lord North's administration (1770-82) memorable for the final separation of the United States of America from the mother-country deserves notice in more detail. The errors of the Government were the direct result of the king's personal will. But Lord North who stayed so long in office must share the blame. At first the general feeling of the nation backed the king and minister in the attempt to force their taxation laws on the colonists who were regarded, not without reason as unruly and seditious persons. The king now became popular which he had not been for some years and was encouraged to go on to the end with the policy which he had so doggedly maintained.

Boston and the Tea ships—The resistance of the colonies to taxes imposed by England continued, and did not cease

even when Lord North repealed all the imposts except a trifling duty on tea. The first blood shed in the quarrel was spilled at Boston in 1770, when the soldiers called in to suppress a small riot fired on the crowd and killed five men. In 1773 the East India Company sent out ships with large cargoes of tea. The people of Boston in order to show their hatred of the British tax boarded the ships and threw the tea into the harbour. Other acts of violence also occurred.

The Thirteen Colonies in Congress—The news of those events made the king and Parliament so angry that various Acts were passed to punish the rebellious colonists, and soldiers were sent out under General Gage. At that time the British colonies in North America excluding Canada, were thirteen in number¹. All of these, with the exception of Georgia in the south, sent delegates to a meeting at Philadelphia called the Continental Congress (1774) which resolved to stop trade with Great Britain until their demands should be granted. The colonists began to raise volunteer troops.

Early Fighting, George Washington—The actual fighting began in 1775 with a skirmish at Lexington near Boston, followed by a more serious engagement in the same region, known as the battle of Bunker's Hill. A second meeting of delegates from all the colonies Georgia included was held in May, styling itself 'The Congress of the United Colonies'. Attempts to arrange terms of peace failed and the command of the colonial rebel forces was taken by George Washington, a gentleman of high character, to whose efforts the final success of the rebellion was mainly due.

Declaration of Independence—The English Government, thinking that the rising could be put down easily by a few troops, had not sent nearly enough men. Lord North did not realize the immensity of the distances in the country and all

¹ The 'thirteen' were four 'New England' colonies inhabited by descendants of exiled Puritans—Massachusetts New Hampshire Connecticut, and Rhode Island—and nine others—New York Pennsylvania New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland Virginia North Carolina South Carolina and Georgia.

CANADA and EASTERN UNITED STATES



the difficulties of various kinds. In fact, mistakes were made like those committed a few years ago at the beginning of the South African War with the Boers. When it was seen that a large force must be sent across the Atlantic, Lord North's Government could not obtain the men in England and was driven to hire troops from small German princes. That step naturally angered the colonists, and incited them to cast off their allegiance to King George. On July 4, 1776, the Congress issued a Declaration of Independence. The existence of the United States as a nation may be reckoned to run from that date. The Fourth of July is still celebrated in the United States as a holiday and festival called Independence Day.

Weakness of the Colonists.—But it was one thing for the colonies to declare themselves independent, and quite another to make their independence a fact. Fighting still went on with varying results, now one side and now the other being victorious. The population of the colonies was then less than one-fourth of that of Great Britain, and the rebels would have found it hard, or perhaps impossible to win if they had been left to fight out the issue by themselves. At times Washington's forces were in such sore need of boots, and in fact of everything, that they were on the point of giving up the contest.

Help given by France and Spain.—The hopes of the colonists were revived by French help at first granted secretly in money and volunteers, and later, in 1778 by an open alliance. A year earlier, John Burgoyne, an English general had been surrounded at Saratoga and compelled to surrender. In 1779 Spain joined France, so that England had her hands more than full. It was indeed, a bad year for Great Britain, which had for the moment lost the command of the sea, owing to the marked improvement effected in the French navy, which just then was better than the English. During the summer the allied French and Spanish fleets sailed proudly up the English Channel, where there was nobody to stop them. But in America the war still went on, rather to the advantage of the English. The difficulties of King George were increased.

in 1780 by a league called the Armed Neutrality, formed by Russia with other powers and directed against the claim made by the English navy of a right to stop neutral vessels at sea and search them for enemies' goods

Surrender of Lord Cornwallis; end of the war.—At last, in 1781, came the end of the American war, Lord Cornwallis, whom we shall meet presently in India and again in Ireland, was blockaded in Yorktown on the coast of Virginia by French and American troops supported by a French fleet, and was thus forced to surrender. The king was anxious to continue the war and retain at least the southern states, but the difficulties were too great. Minorca in the Mediterranean was again taken by the Spaniards, and several of the West Indian islands were captured by the French fleet. Lord North, feeling that the game was lost, resigned office in March 1782.

Rockingham and Shelburne Ministries.—King George, having failed in his attempt to govern the empire himself through a minister who was content to be his servant, had to apply again to the great Whig nobles whom he disliked so much, and to form a new ministry, first under Lord Rockingham and then under Lord Shelburne, with liberty to make peace. Ministers found it easier to come to terms owing to splendid naval victories won by Admiral Rodney (1780, 1782) and the final failure of the efforts of the combined French and Spanish fleets to take Gibraltar.

Siege of Gibraltar—The siege of that fortress, one of the most notable sieges in history, which had begun in July 1779, lasted until February 6 1783, nearly four years. During that time the garrison of about 7,000 men under General Elliott (Lord Heathfield) had resisted the attacks of a force many times more numerous, and had lost only 16 killed and 68 wounded. The fortress, which has never been attacked since then, still watches the entrance to the Mediterranean as an English sentinel.

Treaties of Versailles.—The Treaties of Versailles (sometimes

called the Treaty of Paris),¹ signed in 1783, recognized the independence of the United States, left Minorca in the Mediterranean and Florida in America with the Spaniards, and effected sundry exchanges and restitutions of West Indian Islands and places in other parts of the world

India and Ireland.—In order to give a continuous outline of the story of the War of Independence we have left unnoticed the important events which occurred in India and Ireland. We will turn first to India, where the genius of Warren Hastings balanced the loss of America by the gain of India. 'I gave you all,' he exclaimed in Westminster Hall, 'and you have rewarded me with confiscation, disgrace, and a life of impeachment.' The most difficult part of his task had been done when Lord North resigned, though Hastings remained in India three years longer.

Warren Hastings Governor of Bengal.—We must go back a good many years in order to make the course of Indian affairs intelligible. In 1767 ill health had compelled Clive to quit India, leaving his work unfinished. He had not had time to devise a proper system of government for Bengal, and after his departure the country suffered from gross misgovernment as well as from a terrible famine in 1770. The Directors of the East India Company, looking for a strong man to set things right, found him at Madras in Warren Hastings, who took charge as Governor of Bengal in 1772.


The Regulating Act.—Lord North saw that the acquisition by the Company of a great Indian province made it necessary for the ministers at home to take measures for the regulation of the Indian Government. Parliament accordingly passed a statute known as the Regulating Act of 1773, which established a Governor General in Council and a Supreme Court at Calcutta. Hastings became the first Governor-General. The narrative of the opposition he met with from his councillors, and the Supreme Court, of his dealings with the Indian powers, and his internal reforms may be read in any history.

¹ The city and palace of Versailles are eleven miles south west of Paris.

of India. Here we can notice his action only in so far as it was connected with the French war and English politics.

Hastings's Measures of Defence.—Hastings, far-seeing as usual, had understood the value of an overland service across Egypt for the purpose of quick communication with Europe, and if he had been allowed, would have arranged for regular mails by that route. In 1778 his temporary arrangements for a mail service through Cairo were in working order, so that he was able to receive news early in July that war with France had begun. He was already aware of General Burgoyne's surrender at Saratoga in October of the previous year, and was therefore in a position to realize the dangers threatening *Great Britain and the British possessions in India*. At that time he was engaged in the First Maratha War, brought on by the folly of the Bombay Government. Sir Philip Francis timidly urged the recall of the troops from the Bombay side, but Hastings knew that safety was to be found in advance, not in retreat, and rejected counsels of despair. Swiftly and boldly he met the danger. The Bengal army was increased, the naval defence of Calcutta was provided for, money was extracted from Raja Chait Singh, the French settlements were seized and arrangements were made for alliances with some of the Indian powers.

Defeat and Death of Haidar Ali, Treaty of Mangalore—In July 1780 Haidar (Hyder) Ali of Mysore suddenly invaded the Carnatic with a host of some 90 000 men and appeared before the walls of Madras. In that region all seemed to be lost and but for Hastings all would have been lost. With the gallant help of old Sir Pyro Coote, the efforts of the Governor General were rewarded within twelve months by the total defeat of Haidar Ali at Porto Novo (July 1 1781). Haidar Ali died in December 1782. The war continued by his son Tipu (Tippoo) was ended by the Treaty of Mangalore in January 1784, each party agreeing to give up its conquests. The arrangements although inglorious owing to the errors of



WARREN HASTINGS

the Government of Madras were the best which Hastings had the power to make

End of First Marathā War ; Treaty of Salbāl.—The Marathā War was ended in 1782 by the Treaty of Salbāl, which secured peace between the English and Marāthas for twenty years and gave Bombay the much desired islands of Elephanta and Salsette. The year 1782 was thus memorable for many important events—the resignation of Lord North, the repulse of the main attack on Gibraltar, a naval victory gained by Rodney, the death of Haidar Ali, and the treaty of Salbāl. We shall see presently that the same year was equally memorable in the history of Ireland.

Admiral de Suffren—The large increase in the power of the French navy during the reign of Louis XVI (who had succeeded his grandfather, Louis XV, in 1774) has been already mentioned. The French fleet under Admiral de Suffren operating in the Indian seas was sufficiently strong to cause much anxiety until its activity was stopped by the peace of 1783.

General Result of the Policy of Hastings—The general result of the wars in India and the wise administration of Warren Hastings was that when peace was made the English power had become far stronger than it had been when war began in 1778.

The treaties of Salbāl and Mangalore,' Malleon observes, 'mark the turning of a new page in the history of British India. Thenceforth the English became the dominant factor in the politics of the whole Indian continent. Hastings's foreign policy, pursued through all checks and hindrances, had cleared the road for his successors and traced out the lines along which Lord Wellesley and Lord Hastings were afterwards to work with larger means and far wider official powers.'

That result, due solely to the genius of Warren Hastings, and so ill rewarded by Pitt, was not attained by annexing kingdoms. Hastings was averse to annexation and added

no territory to the Empire except the Ghazipur and Benares Districts and certain small areas close to Bombay.

The Government of Ireland.—We now pass to Ireland, the fortunes of which were much affected by the severe strain on the strength of England during the critical years 1778-83. In order to make the situation understood reference must be made to earlier history. From the time of Henry II (1171) to the reign of Henry VIII, the government of the English colony in Ireland was carried on by the king's representative under the title of Lord (*Dominus*) of Ireland or Lord Deputy.¹ Henry VIII assumed the title of King of Ireland. From that time the King or Queen of England in virtue of his or her English office has also been King or Queen of Ireland, and the various changes in the English succession have taken effect in Ireland without the need for a separate Irish Act of Parliament.

The Irish Parliament; Poynings's Act—Down to the fiftieth year of Edward III (1377) barons, prelates and citizens had been summoned from Ireland to take part in the English Parliament wherever it happened to meet. That practice was given up on account of the inconvenience and expense, until it was revived by Oliver Cromwell in 1654 and 1657. After the Restoration Irish members again ceased to be summoned to England. Beginning at some date after the reign of Edward III, a local Irish Parliament had met from time to time, and was usually at the disposal of the Lord Deputy, who could make it do what he wanted. It met frequently during the reigns of the Lancastrian and Yorkist kings.² Henry VII secured control over both the Lord Deputy and the Dublin Parliament by the statute known as Poynings's Act (1495), from the name of the Lord Deputy at the time. The statute provided that all laws intended to be passed in

¹ John was Lord (*Dominus*) of Ireland under Henry II. Afterwards the king himself was Lord of the island and his representative was Lord Deputy.

² Owing to the loss of the records the early history of the Irish Parliament is obscure.

Ireland should be certified under the great seal of that kingdom, as a mark of authority that they really came from the Irish Parliament, and that they should be returned by the king under his great seal, as a warrant authorizing the Irish Lord Deputy to give the royal assent to them. The Act was passed 'at the request of the Commons' of Ireland, and was regarded in that country at the time and for many years afterwards as a protection against abuse of power by the Lord Deputy. The feeling that the Act was a restriction on Irish national liberty was of much later growth. Henry VII also provided that all English laws should have force in Ireland. It must, of course be understood that in practice English laws of that age could be applied in only a small portion of the island where English people were settled.

The Penal Laws—After the Cromwellian Settlement and the Revolution only Protestants could be members of the Irish Parliament or (from 1727) vote at elections. The purely Protestant local Parliament, which had lively recollections of the rebellion of 1641 (*ante*, p. 187) and the sweeping Act of Attainder passed by the Parliament of James II in 1689 (*ante* p. 227) tried to protect the minority of its own creed against the Catholic majority by a series of ferocious 'penal laws'. It must in fairness be remembered that the law in England and Scotland at the same time although less severe than the Irish code imposed many hardships and disabilities on persons professing the Roman Catholic religion, which was associated in men's minds with treason. The Irish laws were necessarily all sanctioned by English ministers.

The Volunteers, Grattan's Parliament—During the years of national danger beginning with 1778 the English Government was unable to spare troops for the defence of Ireland. The Protestants therefore organized a Volunteer army, which at the close of 1781 numbered more than 80 000 men. Henry Grattan, an eloquent barrister member of the Irish Parliament, led an agitation for the repeal of Poyning's Act and liberty to modify the oppressive English laws which restricted Irish

trade His agitation being backed by the armed Volunteers, Pitt had to pass an English Act giving the Irish Parliament in practice complete independence The Parliament thus formed, which lasted from 1782 to 1800, is remembered as Grattan's Parliament Although it was a purely Protestant body it relaxed the penal laws in many respects

The executive power wielded by the Lord Deputy, now called Lord Lieutenant, was at all times independent of the Irish Parliament and controlled by orders from the English ministry It continued as before during the eighteen years that Grattan's Parliament lasted

The Coalition Ministry; Fox's India Bill.—The ministry of Lord Shelburne, by which the treaties of Versailles (*ante*, p 270) had been concluded, did not last long and was succeeded by the Coalition Ministry, based on the alliance of Lord North with his old opponent, Charles Fox, under the nominal headship of the Duke of Portland That ministry, which was extremely unpopular fell owing to its failure to pass an India Bill for the better government of India drafted by Fox and Burke

Ministry of William Pitt the Younger.—William Pitt the elder, Earl of Chatham had died in 1778, after many years of ill health His younger son bearing the same name who had shown extraordinary ability from childhood had entered Parliament at the age of twenty one and at once made his mark At the end of 1783, when the Coalition Ministry fell King George called on young Pitt, then only twenty four years of age, to become Prime Minister and form a Cabinet Although the House of Commons was hostile to him he accepted the task In 1784 he dissolved Parliament The elections gave him a large majority, which he retained so that he held power for seventeen years, with the full general approval of the nation, but often hampered by the narrowmindedness of the King the Protestant bigotry prevailing in both England and Scotland, and by his own incapacity for directing the operations of war He was intended by nature to be the ruler of a nation

at peace, and was ill fitted to plan campaigns. The early years of his government might be praised without reserve, were it not for the sanction given by him to the unjust persecution of Warren Hastings.

Pitt's India Act of 1784—The Prime Minister relying on the support of the nation at large rather than on the personal favour of the king was able to pass the India Act of 1784 establishing the system of Indian government which lasted without much change until 1858 when Queen Victoria took upon herself the government of the territories in India heretofore administered in trust for her by the Honourable East India Company. The essence of Pitt's plan was that Indian political affairs were placed in the hands of a Secret Committee consisting of the Chairman, Vice Chairman and senior members of the Court of Directors of the Company acting under the supervision and orders of one of the ministers *commonly called the President of the Board of Control*. The management of commercial matters and the patronage of the services were left to the Court of Directors and the proprietors.¹

Return and Impeachment of Warren Hastings—In 1785 Warren Hastings quitted India making over charge to Mr (Sir John) Macpherson pending the appointment of a permanent successor. *Hastings* was well received on his arrival in England (June 1785) but soon found that his old enemy Sir Philip Francis was prepared to attack him with the powerful aid of Edmund Burke. Pitt who at first seemed inclined to support Hastings astonished the House of Commons by declaring his intention to vote for the proposed impeachment on the charge relating to Raja Chait Singh of Benares. That action of Pitt—never fully explained but apparently due to the advice of Dundas—enabled Burke and his friends to go on with the prosecution or rather the persecution of

¹ The Governor-General was appointed by the king but might be recalled by the Directors. They exercised their power in the case of Lord Ellenborough.

the ex Governor General The trial by impeachment before the House of Lords at the prosecution of the Commons began on February 13, 1788, and lasted until June 16, 1794, when it ended in the acquittal of Hastings on all the charges that were tried. It is needless to go into the details, and it may suffice to observe that the justice of the acquittal is now generally admitted.

India and Parliament.—During the discussions on the rival India Bills of Fox and Pitt the affairs of India had served as a peg on which to hang the quarrels of English politicians, without exciting genuine interest on their merits among contending parties. Probably Burke was the only eminent politician in Great Britain who was inspired by heartfelt enthusiasm on the subject of the supposed wrongs of India. When Pitt became firmly established in power Indian subjects ceased to affect parliamentary politics, and since 1784 they have had no appreciable influence on the fate of British ministries.

Lord Cornwallis as Governor General.—Lord Cornwallis, notwithstanding his misfortune at Yorktown (*ante*, p. 270), was selected to be Governor General of the British possessions in India (1786), and being fortunate enough to enjoy the full confidence of the Home Government, was readily granted the power to overrule his Council, for want of which Hastings had suffered so much. Cornwallis went out resolved to act on the declaration of Parliament that ‘to pursue schemes of conquest and acquisition of territory was contrary to the wish, the honour, and the policy of the British nation.’ Fate was too strong for him. Before he came home in 1793 he had fought a war with Tipu (Tippoo) Sultan of Mysore, and had annexed half of his dominions. He was rewarded for his services by promotion to the rank of marquess. Cornwallis, wherever he served, was always the same—an honourable gentleman of the highest character, sensible, discreet, unselfish, and devoted to his country. He effected many reforms in India and left behind him an unsullied reputation.

Internal Changes in Great Britain.—Before proceeding in the next chapter to trace the influence of the French Revolution upon the affairs of Great Britain and Ireland, and to describe the events of the long revolutionary war, it will be well to pause for a moment and consider some of the changes in the condition of England which took place during the eighteenth century.

Summary of the Changes.—Between 1700 and 1800 the population of England and Wales nearly doubled, rising from about 5 millions to between 9 and 10 millions. The first imperfect census or numbering of the people took place in 1801, when the figures gave a total slightly under 9 millions, but probably they were considerably below the truth. The immense increase of the people during the eighteenth century was rendered possible by the spread of cultivation, the introduction of new crops, such as turnips; improved methods of tilling the land, the formation of better breeds of cattle by careful crossing and selection of varieties; the discovery of coal mines and general use of coal; the development of manufactures and improvements in machinery; all combined with a rapid growth of trade.

Increase of the National Debt.—The National Debt (*ante*, p. 230), which stood in round numbers at 36 millions of pounds when George I ascended the throne (1714) had risen to 243 millions in 1784, an increase of 207 millions in seventy years, due to the wars which have been described. Such a burden of debt on which interest had to be paid regularly could not have been borne but for a vast increase in the wealth of the country. The elder Pitt (Lord Chatham) did not trouble himself much about the cost of his policy and spent money freely, but with the assent of the nation, which felt that it could afford the expense. After his death expenditure continued to rise, so that at the end of the Napoleonic wars in 1815 the debt had mounted up to the huge sum of 861 millions. Since then, as already noted (*ante*, p. 247), it has been largely diminished.



LORD CORNWALLIS

Increased wealth; Manufactures.—We have not space to go into details of the various changes which so greatly increased the ability of a small country to bear the enormous expense of wars waged in every quarter of the globe, and can note only a few points out of many. As late as the reign of Charles II the iron for the railings of the new Cathedral of St. Paul in London was obtained from the south-eastern county of Sussex, where the ore was smelted with wood charcoal on a small scale in the primitive fashion practised in India until recently. When the Sussex forests were used up the iron smelting in that region died out. Coal dug up from deep mines, although consumed more or less probably from Roman times, did not come into general use for manufacturing purposes until about the middle of the eighteenth century, when the coal mines of the north of England began to be worked on a large scale. Coal in abundance is essential for all modern industries. Ironworks and weaving and spinning factories soon grew up round the northern coal-fields. The result has been that power and riches have moved extensively from the south—the old kingdom of Wessex—to the North—the old kingdom of Northumbria. The climate of Lancashire in the north-west proved to be specially suitable for cotton spinning. Many improvements in the machinery for spinning and weaving were introduced, and the invention of Watt's steam-engine was the beginning of the existing system of manufacture dependent on steam power. Earlier forms of steam-engines had been little more than curious toys.

Trade; the Middle Classes—The rapid extension of trade with India and other parts of the world enabled many men to amass great fortunes not derived from the land. Thus a large and wealthy 'middle class' of professional and business people grew up which began to claim a share in the government of the country. But the old forms of the constitution, coming down from times when all power had been in the hands of lords and bishops, hindered change. The merchants and middle classes generally did not obtain anything like their rights

until after the Reform Act of 1832, and the needs of the poor were too little thought of until a still later date

Literature; Johnson and Gibbon.—The story of English literature during the eighteenth century must be read in books devoted to the subject. But passing mention may be made of the two most eminent writers of the period—Samuel Johnson, who died in 1783, the year of the treaties of Versailles, and Edward Gibbon, who died in 1794. Johnson, who lives for ever in the pages of his *Life* by James Boswell, was a sort of king among literary men during his later years. The tale of his heroic struggle against grinding poverty for more than thirty years and the picture of his noble character will survive, even if men cease to read the *Vanity of Human Wishes* and the *Lives of the Poets*.

Edward Gibbon, author of *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, may be fairly credited with having produced the greatest history ever written in any language, a book, which may be amended in small details, but can never be superseded.

LEADING DATES

Accession of George III	1760
Capture of Pondicherry, resignation of Pitt	1761
Treaty of Paris and end of Seven Years War, resignation of Lord Bute, Grenville Prime Minister	1763
First American Stamp Act, battle of Buxar	1764
Rockingham Prime Minister	1765
Repeal of Stamp Acts, Chatham Prime Minister	1766
Lord North Prime Minister, Bengal famine	1770
Warren Hastings Governor of Bengal	1772
The Regulating Act, Warren Hastings first Governor General	1773
Battle of Bunker's Hill near Boston	1775
Declaration of Independence by the United States	1776
War with France, death of Lord Chatham	1778
Siege of Gibraltar began, French and Spanish fleets in the English Channel	1779
Invasion of Carnatic by Haidar Ali	1780
Defeat of Haidar Ali at Porto Novo, surrender of Lord Cornwallis at Yorktown	1781

Resignation of Lord North; repulse of main attack on Gibraltar; Rodney's naval victory; death of Haider Ali; Treaty of Salbai with the Maráthas; Grattan's Parliament in Ireland	1782
Treaties of Versailles (Paris); Coalition Ministry	1783
William Pitt the younger, Prime Minister	Dec 1783
Pitt's India Act	1784
Lord Cornwallis Governor General of India	1786
Impeachment of Warren Hastings	1788-94

CHAPTER XXII

THE REIGN OF GEORGE III, THE WAR OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION, 1789-1815

England's task.—England had been hard pressed in 1780 when she had to face at once France, Spain, the revolted American colonies, the Maráthas, and Haider Ali. But she was destined to undergo a still fiercer trial of her strength and endurance in fighting the terrific forces let loose by the French Revolution. The actual fight lasted for twenty two years, from February 1793 to June 1815. The passions of which the Revolution was the expression broke out in 1789 with a crash that startled the world.

The causes of the French Revolution.—In that year the King of France was Louis XVI, who had succeeded his grandfather Louis XV fifteen years earlier. The state of the country was desperate. Liberty in all its forms had been crushed by Louis XIV (*ante* p 218), the common people were ground to the dust by the privileged nobles and clergy who paid no taxes and fulfilled no duties. Continual wars, ruinous taxation, and stupid tyranny had produced general misery, deep discontent, and national bankruptcy. The king, not knowing what else could be done to raise money, ventured to summon the States-General, the assembly of the three estates or orders of nobles, clergy, and commons, which had not been called together for a hundred and seventy five years. He

hoped that they would devise means to fill his empty coffers. But when the States-General met, the despised commons soon showed that they had work to do other than that of supplying the Court with money. They were resolved on reform, and, above all, on the instant abolition of the privileges unjustly enjoyed by the nobles and clergy.

The beginning of the Revolution.—The king, a dull, helpless person, when he attempted resistance raised a whirlwind. In July the Paris mob stormed and captured the Bastille, the grim state-prison fortress which towered over the dwellings of the poorer folk. The Revolution had begun. Presently the oppressed rose fiercely against the oppressors from one end of France to the other, and the old system of government was gone for ever. The States-General became the National Assembly. In April 1792 the Assembly declared war against Austria and Prussia, which had threatened interference in French affairs. In September the abolition of the French monarchy was decreed and a Republic was set up. Terrible massacres of royalist prisoners by the Parisian populace in the same month horrified all Europe, and revolted English opinion which had been inclined to look with favour on the first stages of the Revolution. The English people, who had fought so hard for their own liberty, naturally were disposed to welcome the efforts of the French to shake off the unbearable tyranny from which they suffered, and the more so because the ideas which lay behind the revolutionary movement were largely borrowed from the writings of John Locke and other English philosophers. The early writings of Wordsworth well express the sympathy felt by generous young English minds with the writhings of a people struggling to be free. Edmund Burke gave eloquent expression of the horror excited by the crimes of the Revolution.

War.—In January 1793 the republicans beheaded Louis XVI, and in defiance of England proceeded to invade the Dutch Netherlands. They even declared war on both England and Holland. Pitt, who loved peace and hated war, was forced to

Bonaparte conquered Italy. Even the King of Savoy, the mountainous region in the north-west of that country, who had tried to support Austria and England, was forced to make his peace with the young French conqueror.¹ England was left to continue the struggle alone, save for some help from Austria. Gold became so scarce that in 1797 Parliament gave the Bank of England (*ante*, p. 230) authority to suspend cash payments, that is to say, to refuse to pay gold in exchange for bank-notes. People had to rely on the promise of the Government to pay them in gold when it should be able to do so, and be content to go on for twenty-four years using as money paper notes for which gold could not be obtained in exchange.²

English naval victory of Cape St. Vincent.—In 1797 the French Republic had gained control over Holland, Spain, and Italy. England was the only dangerous enemy. The French hoped to be able to defeat her fleet and to land an army in Ireland, where there was much discontent. A glorious victory gained by Admiral Jervis (Lord St. Vincent) over the Spanish fleet off Cape St. Vincent on the coast of Portugal (February 1797) saved Great Britain and Ireland from the risk of invasion. Nelson did valuable service in the battle.

Naval victory of Camperdown.—Later in the same year Admiral Duncan defeated the French fleet off Camperdown on the coast of Holland, and so confirmed the English command of the sea. But, on the other hand, Austria, the only ally of England, ceased to oppose the French Republic, which was victorious everywhere on land, as England was on sea. Pitt's genius failed him in the conduct of military affairs, which he controlled with little success. The country was saved by the navy.

¹ The ruler of Savoy was known officially as the King of Sardinia, that island having been given to him by Austria in 1720 in exchange for Sicily.

² 'Currency notes' in India correspond to Bank of England notes, and under the present law are exchangeable for either silver or gold, at the rate of 15 rupees to the sovereign.



Napoleon's Indian schemes; battle of the Nile.—General Napoleon Bonaparte, full of pride at the victories won in Europe by the French armies under his command, now dreamed of recovering the Indian Empire lost by Dupleix and Lally (ante, p. 253), hoping that Tipu, Sultan of Mysore, would help him to realize his plans. He avowed his purpose of 'hunting the English out of all their Eastern possessions'. In pursuit of this wild idea he sailed for Egypt with a strong fleet and army, capturing the island of Malta on his way. Bonaparte's scheme for the conquest of the East was brought to nought by Admiral Nelson, who had pursued the French with an English fleet inferior in numbers. Nelson found the French ships in Aboukir Bay at the mouths of the Nile, not far from Alexandria, and attacked them with such skill that the French fleet was destroyed, only four ships escaping. The fight is generally called the 'Battle of the Nile'.

Lord Wellesley's conquest of Mysore.—In the following year (1799) a short and sharp war, in which the British and Indian troops were commanded by General Harris, under the orders of Lord Wellesley, the masterful Governor General of India, completed the work in Mysore begun by Lord Cornwallis (ante, p. 279). On February 3, General Harris took command. On April 4 Tipu lay dead inside the breach in the walls of his capital, Seringapatam. The kingdom founded by Haidar Ali was blotted out. The East India Company took as much territory as they wanted, extending from sea to sea, and divided the remainder between the Nizam and a young prince, representing the old Hindu Rajas of Mysore, who had been turned out by Haidar Ali. Both Nelson and Lord Wellesley, who had so successfully combined to defeat Napoleon's plans, were liberally rewarded, and the House of Commons in its resolution of thanks declared that the Governor General had 'established on a basis of permanent security the tranquillity and prosperity of the British Empire in India'. The words are worth noting as being the earliest official recognition of the existence of a 'British Empire in India'.



Wesley

which was crushed without much serious fighting, but not until dreadful cruelties had been committed on both sides

Pitt's decision for Union—When Grattan's Parliament was set free, the mistake, probably then unavoidable, was made of not restricting its action to local affairs, so that there was constant risk that the Parliaments of Westminster and Dublin might take opposite sides on questions of imperial concern. They actually had done so in 1789 when the king was ill and the *Irish Parliament offered the Regency to the Prince of Wales* with unlimited powers, while the British Parliament intended to limit his authority. Pitt, seeing the dangers likely to arise, and considering the facts of the French invasion and the rebellion of 1798, resolved to effect the Union of the two Parliaments, as the Scotch and English Parliaments had been united in 1707. Lord Cornwallis therefore, was sent to Ireland as Lord Lieutenant with orders to obtain the assent of the Dublin Parliament to Union, and to see the business through.

Change of feeling in Ireland—At first almost all parties in Ireland were bitterly hostile to the Union, but during 1799, when the proposed terms were disclosed, a marked change of feeling took place, and many opponents honestly became supporters of the Prime Minister's measure. Thus the electors of Wexford compelled their member, Mr Nevill, to vote for the Union which he had previously opposed, and the freeholder electors of Galway, about 2 000 in number, in August solemnly adopted the Union policy, cancelling a *resolution of opposition passed in January*. From February, 1799 the Government always had a majority in Parliament which gradually increased and in 1800, when the royal assent to the Act of Union was given, Ireland received the news calmly and without excitement.

Catholic support of the Union.—It is certain that the educated Catholics of Ireland—peers, clergy, and commoners—accepted the Union gladly. They knew that Pitt was personally favourable to the removal of their grievances, and thought

that they had a better chance of relief from the Imperial Parliament than from the Protestant assembly in Dublin. Unhappily the bigotry of the king, and of England and Scotland generally, prevented their hopes from being realized until 1829. The long delay did much to mar the good effects of the Union.

Alleged corruption.—Most people firmly believe, and most historians boldly assert, that the Act of Union was carried through the Irish Parliament merely by gross bribery and corruption. Although one of the few authors on the other side goes too far in affirming that the passage of the measure was 'free from any taint of corruption',¹ the popular beliefs and assertions on the subject are exaggerated. No member of the Irish Parliament seems to have been paid money for his vote, whereas it is proved that at least one member (Mr Whaley) of the Opposition was paid £4,000 for his. Less direct appeal to the personal interests of the members undoubtedly was made, but in a Parliament constituted as that of Ireland was, some jobbery was unavoidable. It is highly probable that certain members were influenced in voting by promises of the numerous peerages distributed after the Act was passed. The payment of the large sum of £1,260,000 for vested interests in 'rotten boroughs' was not corruption. It was justified, as Lecky observes, by 'simple necessity'. The money was paid impartially to supporters and opponents alike, and Pitt had proposed a similar measure in England. Outside Parliament the Union had the hearty support of the Catholics, the great majority of the Irish people, as expressed by all the educated classes attached to the Romish Church. It must be remembered that since 1793 the Catholics of Ireland possessed the right to vote at elections for members of Parliament, which their fellows did not then possess in either England or Scotland, and, as already noted, the Catholic voters, even in the towns, could bring effective pressure to bear on their members to vote for the Union.

¹ T. D. Ingram. Lord Stanhope a judicious and impartial historian, also held that the allegations of corruption rested on 'flimsy grounds'.

Matters of dispute.—Every question connected with the Union being still matter of hot party debate, it is hardly possible to make any statements on the subject which will not be disputed. At the present moment (1911) one powerful party is so dissatisfied with the results of Pitt's measure that it hopes to repeal the Act immediately, whereas another, and perhaps equally powerful party defends it with the utmost zeal. It is therefore undesirable here to discuss further either the way in which the Union was carried or its effects on Ireland. The student may, however, be warned that the current histories need to be read with caution.¹ Since the Act took effect on January 1, 1801, Great Britain and Ireland have been described officially as the United Kingdom.

Terms of the Union—Ireland obtained ample representation in the Imperial Parliament by 4 bishops, 28 elected peers, and 100 members of the House of Commons. Later changes have deprived the four bishops of their seats in the House of Lords and raised the number of Irish members of the House of Commons to 103. The population of the island having diminished, proposals for reducing the number of Irish members of the House of Commons are under consideration (1911). The financial settlement between the two kingdoms was intended to be liberal to the poorer country. The actual working of the arrangements made is the subject of warm controversy.

Bonaparte First Consul—We return to the war with France. The news of French defeats in Germany and Italy made Bonaparte hurry home from Egypt, where he deserted his army. He raised an agitation against the Directory (*ante*, p. 286) and in 1800 succeeded in getting himself appointed as ruler of France under the title of *First Consul* for ten years, extended in 1802 for life. He formed an alliance with Russia

¹ e.g. Green, when he writes — 'it was a sheer question of gold, and the assent of the Irish Parliament was bought with a million in money, and with a liberal distribution of pensions and peerages to its members.' The 'million' seems to mean the £1,260,000 paid for the vested interests in the boroughs which had been long regarded as private property.



NAPOLEON BONAPARTE

and gained brilliant victories in Italy and Austria which compelled the latter power to accept peace. England, supported only by the little kingdom of Portugal, was left alone to continue the war, which she did with great difficulty. The taxation was terribly heavy, an income tax of 10 per cent being levied in addition to other imposts of many kinds.

Resignation of Pitt — Pitt, as we have seen, was willing to free the Irish Catholics from their grievances. But the king was resolutely opposed to that policy, and was backed by English and Scotch feeling which connected the cause of the Catholic claims with the hated French Revolution and dreaded Bonaparte. Pitt, being unable to fulfil the hopes held out to the Catholics of Ireland, resigned office for that reason in February, 1801.

Addington Prime Minister, Malta; Egypt.—It was not easy to fill his place. Mr Addington (Lord Sidmouth), who had been a good Speaker of the House of Commons, was made Prime Minister, a post for which he was unfit. Although the Government was feeble the war went on with results favourable to England. The important island of Malta in the Mediterranean, a better base for a fleet than the lost Minorca (*ante*, p. 271) was taken in 1800, and still is one of the most valued possessions of England, guarding the direct way to India. The French troops were turned out of Egypt (1801) with the help of a force sent from India by the Marquess Wellesley, Governor-General. The dispatch of that force which included both Europeans and sepoy, is remarkable as the first instance in which the armed strength of India was used on foreign service against a European power.

French The northern league, which Bonaparte had taken much trouble to form, thus ceased to exist


Temporary Peace of Amiens.—Notwithstanding the gain of so many successes, England was tired of the war and longed for peace. Draft conditions having been accepted in October, 1801, a definite treaty of peace was signed at Amiens in the north of France on March 28, 1802¹. The English had agreed to give up Malta on certain terms, but disputes arose about that matter and others, so that war began again in May, 1803, to go on for twelve more weary years

The French in India.—In India the Marquess Wellesley luckily had delayed to restore the French settlements as agreed at Amiens, and was thus saved the trouble of reconquering them. At that time Perron, a French general, commanded a strong force in Sindia's service in northern India, and the Governor General was bound to guard carefully against the possible revival of French power. The victories of Lord Lake in 1803 over the Marathas and their foreign commanders finally disposed of French hopes in the north, as those of General Harris over Tipu had done in the south

The Emperor Napoleon.—In May, 1804, General Bonaparte exchanged the title of First Consul for that of Emperor of the French, and is henceforth to be known as the Emperor Napoleon. At that time he was practically master of all continental Europe. England alone withstood him. The strongest desire of his heart, therefore, was to humble the proud island enemy whose fleets checked his ambition and took away from him the fruits of his victories on land. The Spanish navy, as well as the French, being at his disposal, he expected to be able to invade England with success, and assembled a large army at Boulogne for the purpose

Battle of Trafalgar.—England was saved by Nelson, her

¹ The treaty recognized English rule in Ceylon, which had been taken from the Dutch in 1798. Ceylon is governed as a Crown Colony under the Secretary of State for the Colonies, not as part of the Indian Empire, to which naturally it should be attached



THE VICTORY

Napoleon master of Europe; Spanish resistance—For some six years after Austerlitz Napoleon was in practice sovereign of all Europe, excepting the United Kingdom, making and unmaking kings at his pleasure. He appointed his brothers to be kings of Naples, Holland, and Spain, and seemed to be invincible. His attempt to annex Portugal and subdue Spain was the beginning of his ruin. The Portuguese and Spanish peoples, being resolved not to bear the rule of a French despot, offered universal national resistance differing in kind from that made by the professional armies of Italy and Germany. That resistance, stiffened by British regular armies, and guided by Wellington, at least the equal of Napoleon in military genius, made the final victory of Waterloo possible. The Spanish war will be remembered for all time as the Peninsular War, so named because it was fought in the peninsula comprising the kingdoms of Spain and Portugal.

The Marquess Wellesley in India.—Before we proceed to relate the beginning and end of the gigantic final struggle against Napoleon in Europe, certain other events claim attention. From this time forward the history of England is to a large extent the history of the world, and the student must try to follow the course of events in many regions widely separated. In India the Marquess Wellesley, aided by his brother Sir Arthur Wellesley, afterwards Duke of Wellington, and other capable generals, had put an end to the independent power of the Peshwa by the Treaty of Bassein (1802), and had weakened that of Sindia and Holkar by the Second Maratha War during the course of which many battles were fought. The most notable was the victory won by Sir Arthur Wellesley in 1803 at Assaye near Aurangabad in the Deccan over the army of Sindia at least ten times more numerous than his. Those events definitely fixed the position of the British as the paramount power in India.

Recall of Lord Wellesley.—But the expense of Wellesley's conquests was distasteful both to the Directors of the East India Company and to the Home Government, who agreed

in recalling the Governor General (1805), and sending out Lord Cornwallis with orders to pursue a cheap peace policy. Cornwallis was then sixty seven years of age, far too old, as he well knew, for the task imposed on him. He died in a few months, and was succeeded, first by Sir George Barlow, and then by Lord Minto (1807),¹ who both received similar instructions.

Lord Minto's Conquests.—The orders from home could not be obeyed. Lord Minto found himself obliged to oppose French influence in the East, and in so doing to send missions to Persia and Afghanistan, to fix the Sutlaj as the Sikh frontier, to capture the island of Mauritius with its dependencies, then a nest of pirates, and to conquer Java. That is a long list of strong measures taken by a Governor General supposed to practise a peace policy. The taking of Mauritius (1810) was an immense relief to British and Indian trade, which had lost three millions sterling in fifteen years from attacks by the pirates of the island. It is still British territory, but the rich island of Java, taken in 1811 by an admirably planned and well commanded expedition, was given back to the Dutch at the general peace. It had been attacked because in 1811 Holland was in French hands.

Conquest of Cape of Good Hope and British Guiana.—Even more important than the capture of Mauritius was the permanent occupation of the Dutch colonies at the Cape of Good Hope in 1806. England thus secured an invaluable half way house on the long sea route between Europe and India. At that time all ships had to go round the Cape. The Suez Canal, giving a shorter route by the Mediterranean and Red Sea, guarded by Malta and Aden, was not opened until the close of 1869. The Cape Colony has since grown into the Union of South Africa, a vast territory comprising several States. British Guiana in the north of South America was taken from the Dutch in 1804, and sundry West Indian islands were captured from time to time. Sugar was then the principal

¹ Great grandfather of the late Viceroy

article of trade in those countries Other branches of business have grown up since

The Slave Trade and Slavery.—During the first half of the eighteenth century nobody seems to have thought the cruel trade in African negroes to be wrong, but in later times men's consciences began to feel uneasy about the matter. In England Clarkson, Wilberforce, and other gentlemen, with the warm approval of Pitt, took steps to abolish the trade in slaves. Their efforts resulted in 1807 in the passing of an Act which made the trade illegal from January 1, 1808. Later Acts enforced the prohibition by the severest penalties. The keeping of slaves, as distinguished from trading in them, was not forbidden in the colonies until 1833, nor in India until ten years after that date.

Destruction of Prussian Army.—On the Continent of Europe Napoleon was supreme. The Prussian army was destroyed at Jena and Auerstadt, the Russians were defeated, and the Tsar was obliged to sign a treaty of peace with his conqueror at Tilsit (1807). 'Thus,' Mr Fortescue declares, 'was the most perilous moment to which England was brought by external enemies during the entire war of the French Revolution and Empire.' Napoleon sought to ruin British sea-borne trade by the Decrees of Berlin and Milan, but did more harm to his own country than to England by those measures, for France could not do without the British trade.

The Peninsular War.—We now come to the Peninsular War in which Wellington, who had returned from India, began the destruction of Napoleon's overgrown dominion. The immediate cause of the war was the emperor's annexation of Portugal, England's ancient ally since the fourteenth century. In July, 1808, an alliance between England and Spain was signed and British troops were sent to Portugal under Sir Arthur Wellesley (Wellington) and Sir John Moore. The defeat of the French at Vimera in that year resulted in their temporary withdrawal from Portugal under the terms of the Convention of Cintra, which was severely criticized in



THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON
From the portrait in the National Portrait Gallery

England as being needlessly generous to the beaten French army Wellesley who was not responsible for the Convention, was recalled for a time on account of the popular clamour. But next year (1800) he was sent out again and the rest of the history of the great war is for the most part the story of his hard fought victories

Napoleon and Wellington—The Emperor Napoleon himself took command in Spain towards the close of 1808 and occupied Madrid the capital where his brother Joseph was set up as king for the second time Although Napoleon and Wellington (for it is convenient to give Sir Arthur Wellesley his later title) never met in Spain they were really the opponents throughout the struggle Napoleon himself was not able to stay long in the Peninsula and had to leave the conduct of the war to his generals Soult Masséna and others acting under his instructions If he had been able to continue to command in person it is possible that the result might have been different.

Wellington's victories were won in spite of much factious opposition inadequate support from home and many disappointments due to the failure of his Spanish and Portuguese allies to give him timely help But he never wavered or lost confidence Through all dangers and difficulties he remained unshaken and serene until at last his purpose was achieved and the French were driven across the Pyrenees It would be impossible to make the course of the war intelligible without going into minute details of battles and sieges unsuitable for an elementary sketch and the student would be none the wiser for a long bare list of engagements with strange names

Closing stages of the War—Therefore passing by Talavera, Salamanca and many other famous battles which gradually wore out the French strength it may suffice to say that in June 1813 Napoleon's brother King Joseph suffered a ruinous defeat at Vittoria in the north of Spain losing all his baggage and artillery That battle followed by a series of other fights, opened up the way across the Pyrenees for Wellington who entered France at the close of 1813 The last battle of the

war was fought at Toulouse in the south of France in April, 1814—a needless sacrifice of brave men's lives, inasmuch as before the fight Napoleon had abdicated. But at Toulouse they had not heard the news in time.

Causes of Napoleon's Fall.—Although the Peninsular War had a great deal to do with Napoleon's fall, it was not the sole cause. Puffed up with pride, and believing himself to be unconquerable, the emperor had resolved in 1812 to undertake the conquest of Russia with a host of 600,000 men, including French, Germans, and Italians. He penetrated the country to Moscow, the ancient capital, far in the interior, and seemed to be victorious. But he lingered there too long, the city was set on fire, and Napoleon, finding himself in a position which he could not hold, was compelled to retire. The discipline of his men had become so slack that they failed to keep any order in their march, and in consequence the long retreat during the cold of winter in those regions destroyed the Grand Army, of which only a miserable remnant escaped. The failure of Napoleon's daring adventure encouraged Europe to rise against its oppressor. The 'Battle of the Nations' at Leipzig (October 16–18, 1813) in Saxony, when 300,000 troops of the allied nations of the Continent met a French army of 180,000 and fought for three days, decided Napoleon's fate. The complete victory of the allies was followed up by their invasion of France from the east and entry into Paris. Meantime, as we have seen, Wellington had crossed the Pyrenees and occupied the south.

Abdication and Death of Napoleon.—Napoleon, being unable to offer further resistance, abdicated, and was sent to the tiny island of Elba in the Mediterranean. The crown of France was bestowed by the allies on Louis XVIII, brother of King Louis XVI, who had been beheaded by the revolutionists.¹

¹ He was called Louis XVIII because the young son of Louis XVI was regarded as Louis XVII. That boy, who had been imprisoned with his mother, the queen, during the Revolution, disappeared, and his fate has never been clearly ascertained. Many people believe that he escaped and

The rule of the new king was so unpopular that Napoleon thought he had a chance of recovering the throne. Escaping from Elba in February, 1815, he landed in France and was eagerly welcomed by his old soldiers, who crowded to serve him in the war known as that of the Hundred Days. The European powers solemnly outlawed Napoleon and declared him to be 'the general enemy and disturber of the world', and so 'abandoned to public justice'. Enormous efforts were made to obtain the men and money needed to crush the 'general enemy'. England contributed eleven millions sterling and all the men whom she could collect, while the other powers were equally energetic. The allied armies of England and Prussia met Napoleon on the field of Waterloo (*June 21, 1815*), near Brussels in Belgium. The Prussians gave valuable indirect help, but the direct attack of the French was met by Wellington. All day long Napoleon's choicest troops flung themselves bravely against the deadly fire and bayonets of the steadfast British infantry formed in squares, and all day long they failed to break through those squares. In the evening the Prussians under Blücher's command, whose march had been delayed, arrived and completed the rout of the French. Next day Napoleon again abdicated. Three weeks later he surrendered to the English, and was sent to the lonely island of St. Helena in the middle of the Atlantic, where, in 1821, in the fifty second year of his age, he sadly ended his days, the most striking example in history of the 'vanity of human wishes'.

War with the United States of America.—During the later years of the great war England became involved in a minor conflict with the United States. The trouble arose from Napoleon's Berlin decree designed to stop British trade (*ante*, p. 302), and the English Orders in Council of 1807 and 1808, which replied to that decree by forbidding trade with France, Holland, and parts of Germany and Italy. The

was afterwards known as Karl Wilhelm Naundorff, a watchmaker at Spandau in Prussia, but the actual truth seems to be past finding out

Americans resented those high handed Orders and the claim to the right of search of neutral vessels made by the British Navy. War began in June, 1812. At first the fighting was confined to American raids on Canada, which all failed, and combats between individual ships in which the Americans usually won. When Wellington's victories set free veteran soldiers from the Peninsular armies, more vigorous action was taken by the British. An expedition captured Washington, the capital of the States, and burned the public buildings (1814), a proceeding not to be commended. After some other operations peace was signed at Ghent in Belgium (December, 1814) and ratified in 1815. The war is commonly spoken of in England and the United States as the 'War of 1812'.

Indian Affairs.—In 1813 the charter of the East India Company was renewed for a period of twenty years, with the important change that the Indian trade was thrown open to all comers. The Company kept its exclusive rights in the China seas until 1833, when the last remnant of its monopoly was abolished. The efforts of the Home Government to restrain the expansion of the British Empire in India had not produced the desired effect. In 1813, when Lord Hastings took over charge from Lord Minto as Governor General, he found 'seven different quarrels likely to demand the decision of arms' awaiting him. The first of such quarrels to be decided was that with the Kingdom of Nepal, which was fought out between 1814 and 1816, resulting in the acquisition by the British of valuable territory in the lower Himalaya ranges.

Ministerial Changes.—When Pitt passed away in 1806 a Cabinet was formed by the deceased statesman's cousin, Lord William Grenville, which included Fox for the few months that he had to live, and was known as the 'ministry of all the talents'.¹ Early in the following year, 1807, the King, by a strong exercise of royal power, turned his ministers out of

¹ Third son of George Grenville of Stamp Act fame. Mr Fortescue calls his Government the 'ministry of all the blunders'. It made a mess of the war.

office, and was supported in his action by the country. A new ministry was formed under the nominal headship of the Duke of Portland, but chiefly controlled by Lord Castlereagh (Londonderry), who had done so much to carry the union with Ireland, and George Canning, a brilliant young barrister and a disciple of Pitt. When the Duke of Portland died in 1809 his place as Prime Minister was taken by Mr Spencer Perceval, who carried on the war with spirit until 1812, when he was murdered by a madman. Lord Liverpool, who succeeded him, retained office for nearly fifteen years, until February, 1827. He like the king, was a man of strong prejudices, absolutely opposed to all sorts of domestic reform. The events of the French Revolution, regarded with horror by most of the English people, had led them to associate even perfectly reasonable projects of much needed reforms with the wild excesses of the Paris mob and the tyranny of Napoleon, so that it was possible for a statesman with opinions like those of Lord Liverpool to retain power. He was a good man of business. Towards the end of his long term of office popular feeling changed and began to desire reform, which followed, *after much trouble, as will appear in the next chapter*.

King George III.—We have seen that in 1789 the king had suffered from a temporary attack of madness, which passed away before the arrangements for a Regency had been completed (*ante*, p. 292). In 1801 the shock of Pitt's resignation brought on another attack and ten years later the king's malady became lasting and incurable. The Prince of Wales, who was appointed Regent, continued as such until his accession to the throne. The reign of George III practically ended in 1811. The king although not a genius, was neither so stupid nor devoid of taste as some writers represent him to have been. He loved good music, encouraged the excellent English painters of his time, and collected a magnificent library, now in the British Museum. He was a thorough Englishman, devoted to the cause of his country, and, although mistaken, perhaps, in his measures, did no more

than his duty in resisting as long as possible the separation of the American colonies. He was very near being successful in keeping at least the southern states, and if he had had the luck to succeed we should have heard little about his obstinacy. He showed remarkable moral courage in dismissing the 'ministry of all the talents' in 1807, and the following general election proved that his high-handed action had the approval of the country. His aversion to Whig politicians, Fox and the rest, was distasteful to the brilliant Whig authors who have done so much to guide current opinion concerning English history, and his reputation, in consequence, has been rather hardly used. It must, of course, be admitted that he made serious mistakes, and disliked new ideas opposed to his firmly rooted prejudices.

Congress of Vienna.—The fall of Napoleon after the battle of Leipzig brought down with him all the new kingdoms and states which he had formed in Europe. A Congress of representatives of the powers, appointed to make by consent more permanent arrangements, accordingly met at Vienna in the autumn of 1814 and continued its sittings until June 9, 1815, a few days before the battle of Waterloo. Napoleon's return for the Hundred Days had little effect on the decisions of the Congress, which are too numerous to be stated in detail. Only some of the provisions specially affecting the United Kingdom and British Empire need be mentioned.

Hanover received additional territory and was raised to the rank of a kingdom, the King of England continuing to be also King of Hanover until 1837. Great Britain was confirmed in the possession of Malta, Cape Colony, and Mauritius, but Java was restored to the Dutch,¹ and Pondicherry, with the other small French settlements in India, was given back to the King of France. The distribution of territory effected by the Congress was made without the slightest regard for the wishes of the peoples disposed of by the statesmen sitting in Vienna.

¹ Great Britain paid six millions sterling to Holland, which gave up all claim to the Cape of Good Hope and Ceylon.

Most of the arrangements then made on the continent of Europe have been changed by later events, but Great Britain still retains Malta, Mauritius, and the Cape. The Congress passed an important resolution, moved by Lord Castlereagh, condemning the practice of trading in slaves which England had declared to be illegal in 1807 (*ante*, p. 302)

LEADING DATES

Meeting of French States General, storming of the Bastille	1789
Execution of Louis XVI, declaration of war by France against England and Holland	1793
The Directory in France	1794
British naval victories of Cape St. Vincent and Camperdown	1797
Rebellion in Ireland, battle of the Nile	1798
Conquest of Mysore	1799
Act of Union with Ireland passed, Napoleon Bonaparte First Consul	1800
Resignation of Pitt French expelled from Egypt, battle of Copenhagen	1801
Peace of Amiens, Treaty of Bassein	1802
Renewal of French war, battle of Assaye in India	1803
Napoleon becomes emperor, Pitt resumes office	1804
Battles of Trafalgar and Austerlitz	1805
Death of Pitt and Fox conquest of Cape of Good Hope	1806
Slave trade declared illegal	1807
Beginning of Peninsular War battle of Vimeira Convention of Cintra	1808
Battles and sieges of Peninsular War	1808-13
Capture of Mauritius	1810
Capture of Java	1811
War with America	1812-14
Battle of Vittoria, battle of Leipzig Indian trade thrown open	1813
Battle of Toulouse, end of Peninsular War	1814
Congress of Vienna	1814-15
Battle of Waterloo	June 21, 1815

CHAPTER XXIII

THE CLOSING YEARS OF THE REIGN OF GEORGE III, THE
REIGNS OF GEORGE IV AND WILLIAM IV, 1815-37

Treaty of Paris.—The arrangements made by the Congress of Vienna were confirmed by the Treaty of Paris, signed on November 20, 1815, which deprived France of all territory acquired since the Revolution—that is to say, since 1790—and imposed on her the payment of a heavy war indemnity.

Peace, with some Exceptions.—The United Kingdom now entered on a long period of peace, unbroken until 1854, except for wars in India and other distant parts of the world which did not seriously disturb the nation at home. The narrative in this chapter, therefore, will be concerned with internal domestic events and reforms more than with foreign wars and conquests.

Distress in England.—The long-continued French war had enriched the landowners and big farmers by the high prices obtained for the produce of the land, and much money had been made by contractors, merchants, and manufacturers. But the labouring poor suffered grievously. The rapid growth of the number of the people kept wages down, the introduction of machinery destroyed the ancient small industries, and threw many persons out of employment, while the high prices meant starvation to the ill paid workmen. The sudden stoppage of a war which had lasted for twenty two years and to which the country had become accustomed, caused a great disturbance of prices and left multitudes of discharged sailors and soldiers without work. Certain defects in the poor laws founded on Elizabeth's Act of Parliament (*ante*, p 163), and lack of judgement in administering the law, had done infinite harm to the poor, while the rates, or local taxes for support of paupers, were raised beyond endurance. The misery was increased by the badness of the harvest in 1816, so that, all things considered, peace seemed to have its troubles no less than war.

Discontent and Repression.—The sufferings of the poor in those days naturally caused discontent, which found expression in riots. In 1820 certain desperate men actually conspired to murder the whole Cabinet. For some years after Waterloo the English Government continued to be guided by the feeling of horror for all change which had been roused by the doings of the French revolutionists, and showed little willingness to remedy the misery of the people by seeking to remove its causes. The ruling classes were too much inclined to trust only to forcible suppression of popular movements. The Habeas Corpus Act (*ante*, p 215) was suspended for a time in 1817 and 1818, and meetings considered seditious were forbidden under severe penalties. Thoughtful men, therefore, began to consider how they could devise a 'radical' cure by going to the root of the matter, and lessening the distress made manifest by riots and conspiracies. The reformers, in consequence, became known as Radicals, the name which still attaches to advanced Liberals. A slight improvement in the condition of the country took place in 1818, but trouble was renewed the next year, and public meetings were sternly suppressed.

Death of George III; Accession of George IV.—Old King George, insane and blind, passed away in 1820, having completed 81 years, the greatest age ever attained till then by an English sovereign. His reign had lasted nominally for sixty years, but had really come to an end in 1811, when he became permanently mad. His son, who had been prince regent from that date, ascended the throne as George IV. The change of his position from that of regent to that of king made little difference. He was a man of evil life, deserving of no personal respect. Great scandal was caused by his quarrels with the queen whom he sought to divorce. The shameful dispute was ended by her death in 1821.

Pindari and Third Marāthā Wars.—Before we give an account of the most important domestic measure of George IV's reign, that known as 'Catholic Emancipation', we must notice certain foreign affairs, namely, the brilliant administration of

the Marquess of Hastings in India, which lasted for nine years and a quarter, from October 1813 until January 1823, the First Burmese War; and the war of Greek independence. The war with Nepal (1814-16) has been already mentioned (*ante*, p. 307). The most notable achievement of Lord Hastings was his suppression, in 1817, of the hordes of Pindari robbers by a well planned campaign, during which the Governor General employed a force of 120,000 men. The struggle with the Pindaris merged into the Third Maratha War, resulting in the shattering of Maratha power and the annexation of the territory now called the Central Provinces. The Government of the Marquess of Hastings found time to attend to the affairs of peace as well as those of war. It established schools and colleges, managed the finances with success, and carried out important public works in Calcutta and other places.

First Burmese War.—Lord Hastings was succeeded by Lord Amherst, who was unwillingly forced into hostilities with Burma—the First Burmese War. The bragging Burmans were defeated and by the Treaty of Yandabo ceded Assam, Arakan, and Tenasserim to the British. The newly acquired provinces were added to the Indian Empire (1826).

Greek War of Independence.—The people of Greece, who had suffered much from Turkish misrule, listened, like the rest of Europe, to the teaching of the French revolutionists, and began to plan measures to win their freedom. Encouraged by the Russian Government, which had objects of its own in view, the Greeks rebelled in 1821. Fighting continued for several years until the Sultan of Turkey obtained the assistance of a strong fleet from his vassal, the Pasha of Egypt, and seemed to be on the point of crushing the Greek resistance. Russia, France, and England then intervened to save Greece. Without any regular declaration of war, the fleets of the European powers fought the combined Turkish and Egyptian fleets in the Bay of Navarino on October 20, 1827, and utterly destroyed them. Two years later Greece was set up as a small independent kingdom which still exists.

State Churches.—During the course of this history we have often had occasion to observe how each European State felt bound to choose one or other form of the Christian faith as the religion of the State, to support and defend the organized Church composed of the adherents of that form of religion, and to regard as hostile to the State all persons who took the liberty of dissenting from the official Church. The idea—so familiar to Indian thought—that the religion of each man is his own affair and not that of anybody else was slow to take root in Europe and was seldom heard of for many generations.

Enforcement of Outward Conformity—In Great Britain and Ireland mere difference of opinion on religion was regarded as liable to punishment—persecution we now call it—until about the time of the Civil War, but after that time the Governments of the three kingdoms ceased to pry into men's opinions, while continuing to be strict in enforcing outward conformity to the State Church. Penalties and disabilities more or less severe were imposed on persons who refused to prove their conformity by going to the parish church, taking the sacrament of Holy Communion in a particular way, and so forth. For a long time both Protestant Dissenters and Roman Catholics suffered equally, or nearly so, but the Toleration Act of William III (1689) removed the worst grievances of the Protestant sects.

Severe Treatment of Roman Catholics—Roman Catholics, however, were still regarded as enemies, or at least as possible enemies, of the State. That sentiment, which had come down from Tudor times when Popes had ventured to threaten English sovereigns with deposition, was kept alive by the memory of the strong support given by Catholics to the Jacobite rebellions of 1715 and 1745. Adherents of the Catholic or Roman Catholic Church in all the three kingdoms were not permitted to serve in Parliament, to practise at the Bar, or to do many other things lawful for everybody else. In Ireland under the Penal Laws of the eighteenth century, their position was

peculiarly distressing, chiefly because they formed the large majority of the population, and in less degree because the Irish laws were specially severe. In 1793 the Irish Parliament repealed the most irritating parts of the Penal Laws, and threw open to Roman Catholics the degrees of the University of Dublin. About the same time a similar measure was passed for Scotland. In England the Catholics continued to be hardly used.

Catholic Relief—The younger Pitt, as we have seen, was anxious to get rid of the barbarous laws against the Catholics throughout the United Kingdom but was unable to carry his proposals on account of the bigotry of King George III and the bulk of the English people. He resigned office in consequence (1801), and for many years afterwards proposals for 'Catholic Relief' or 'Emancipation' could not obtain a fair hearing. The motive power to carry the much needed reform came from Ireland through the means of a powerful Catholic Association formed in that country (1823) under the leadership of Daniel O'Connell, an orator of singular eloquence. At last Sir Robert Peel and the Duke of Wellington, who had hitherto fought against the Catholic claims, were unable to resist them any longer. They accordingly, in spite of the scruples of King George IV, passed the Catholic Relief Act of 1829 and so closed the main struggle. But some minor connected reforms remained to be effected later.

Provisions of the Act of 1829—The Act of 1829 admitted Roman Catholics to both Houses of Parliament to all offices in municipal corporations and the like, to judgeships and, generally speaking, to all civil and political offices. The only offices from which they remained excluded were those of Regent, Lord Chancellor of either England or Ireland, and Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. A later Act threw open to them the Lord-Chancellorship of Ireland. The Marquess of Ripon, the Governor General and Viceroy of India (1880-4), who was a Roman Catholic and the only member of that Church who has held the office, could not have been appointed Governor-

General under the law as it stood before 1829. The Act of Settlement (1701), which is still in force requires the sovereign to be a Protestant and member of the Church of England. A recent Act (1910) has freed His Majesty from the necessity of taking a certain oath the terms of which were offensive to his Roman Catholic subjects who are now numerous in several provinces of the British Empire. The fact that Roman Catholics are still excluded from the throne and three great offices does not seem to cause much irritation or be felt as a serious grievance. Any attempt to change the law would rouse Protestant feeling and cause more trouble than the change would be worth.

Changes of Ministry—When Lord Liverpool resigned in 1827 after fifteen years of power he was succeeded by Mr Canning (*ante* p 308) who died a few months later. The principal event of his brief term of office was the treaty with France and Russia which led to the battle of Navarino (*ante* p 313). Canning's place was taken but not filled by Viscount Goderich afterwards Earl of Ripon and father of the Marquess of Ripon, Indian Viceroy from 1880 to 1884. Lord Goderich whose abilities were not equal to the duties of his high office had to resign in January 1828¹. King George IV then called on the Duke of Wellington to form a Government. The duke became Prime Minister with Sir Robert Peel the son of a wealthy cotton manufacturer as Home Secretary and leader of the House of Commons.

Accession of William IV.—In the summer of 1830 King George IV died. He was a selfish dissolute man whom it was impossible to regret. He left no legitimate children and was succeeded by his younger brother William IV, an eccentric prince who had seen a good deal of service in the navy.

He would have passed it is said 'in private life for a good natured sailor. The new King although more respectable and better liked than his predecessor was not of much greater importance in matters of state.

¹ Mr Disraeli described him as a transient and embarrassed phantom.

Question of Parliamentary Reform.—The question of Catholic Relief having been disposed of, the subject of Parliamentary Reform now came to the front. Pitt had tried to do something in the matter, but was powerless while the English people were still so frightened at the results of the French Revolution that they could not consider calmly even moderate schemes for mending the machinery of government. In 1830, however, the terror produced by the doings of the revolutionists and Napoleon had passed away, and the nation was beginning to understand the necessity for changes to suit changed times. During the year in which George IV died the French turned out their Bourbon king, Charles X, who had succeeded his brother, Louis XVIII (*ante*, p. 305), and chose in his stead a distant cousin, Louis Philippe, who undertook to govern after the fashion of an English king rather than in the old arbitrary style of the Bourbons. That fresh revolution in France encouraged English reformers desirous of reducing the influence of the great landowners and increasing the power of the middle classes—the professional and trading sections of the people—because Louis Philippe relied for support on the corresponding classes in France and his elevation to the throne by their help proved that the influence of the ancient ruling families could be overthrown by the new forces of modern life.

Theory of Representation.—The theory of a parliament requires that the assembly should fairly represent the opinions and will of the whole country. We may leave the House of Lords out of consideration for the moment, and confine our attention to the House of Commons, the members of which are elected by certain groups of voters. When the electors of the town of Oxford for example, choose a member to ‘represent’ them in Parliament, they are supposed to be free to elect the best man available, without being influenced by bribes or any unfair practices, and the member elected is supposed to speak in the House of Commons on behalf of the whole town and to be at liberty to give his vote in the House solely from motives of the public interest. In order to secure

anything like fair 'representation' it is further essential that all reasonably qualified persons in the town should have a vote, so that the majority of votes recorded in favour of the member elected may fairly indicate the will of the town as a whole. Similarly all the principal interests and classes throughout the country should be reflected in the House of Commons.

Abuses.—In 1830 the facts did not correspond with the theory in the least. Towns and counties with a large and intelligent population were often not represented at all while the sites of decayed villages with few inhabitants, or even none, sometimes returned two members each. The Tudors and Stuarts had purposely granted charters to many petty towns or villages empowering them to send members to Parliament, so that the king might have their votes in the House and be able to do what he pleased. In those places and many others there was no freedom of election. Multitudes of so-called elections were shams, the member being returned either to the order of a powerful landholder or by sheer purchase. The result of such abuses and others was that the House of Commons in 1830 represented one class only that of the landowners, while the other interests in the country could not make themselves heard in Parliament.

Opposition to Reform—Although the existence of gross abuses could not be denied many excellent and able men like the Duke of Wellington, honestly believed that matters had been so well arranged by Providence that the system in its actual working was something like perfection and that a better Parliament could not be obtained by any reform. The House of Lords was full of such men who looked on Reform as an invention of the devil. But outside of Parliament thousands of eager Reformers were convinced that much needed new laws could not be enacted by a House of Commons of the old sort, and were resolved to effect changes which should make the House more truly 'represent' the nation in all its parts.

The Reform Bill.—The Duke of Wellington, having resigned

office in 1830, was succeeded by Lord Grey, who had as his principal colleagues Lord John Russell, Lord Melbourne, and Lord Althorp. In those days most of the ministers were either lords or their relations.

Lord John Russell brought in a Bill for removing the worst abuses, which in its final form, as passed, swept away altogether fifty six 'rotten boroughs', reduced the number of members returned by thirty other small towns, and gave members to many important places like Manchester and Birmingham, hitherto not represented. Rules were also laid down which greatly increased the number of voters both in the country districts and in the towns of the United Kingdom. But the opposition to the Bill when first introduced was so strong that it was withdrawn and Parliament was dissolved. Then intense excitement was aroused throughout the land, and the Bill easily passed through the newly elected House of Commons. The House of Lords, however, ventured to reject it in October 1831. That action angered the people and caused fierce riots in some places, so that there was talk of civil war. The Bill was brought in for the third time. The Lords tried to alter it. But Lord Grey forced the king to promise to create fifty new peers if necessary, so as to ensure the Government a majority in the House. In the end the Duke of Wellington persuaded the Lords to give way and the Bill passed in June 1832. The reforms then made have been widely extended by later legislation, but even now complaints that the House of Commons does not truly 'represent' the nation are often made, and with some show of reason. Further changes in the constitution of the House and the mode of election of its members may be expected at an early date.

Sundry Reforms.—The short reign of William IV was remarkable for other important measures of reform and improvement besides the Act dealing with elections for Parliament. Abuses connected with the collection of tithes in Ireland, that is to say, a cess on land for the payment of the Protestant clergy, were partly remedied, but not until the attempts at collection of

the cess had caused many violent crimes. A beginning was made in organizing a regular system of education in the same island, where much still remains to be done in that matter. The cruel overworking of children in English factories was checked, and the first step was thus taken in framing a long series of laws designed to protect the weaker classes of factory workers against the greed of heartless employers. The negligent thoughtless system of poor relief which had grown up was stopped, and more reasonable measures were adopted, making residence in the workhouse, as a general rule, compulsory on all persons seeking relief. The system established in 1834 is still in force, but defects in it having been disclosed by long experience, changes to suit present conditions are now under consideration. The subject is one of extreme difficulty, because it is not easy to give kind, liberal treatment to the deserving destitute poor and at the same time to prevent abuse by the idle and worthless of relief granted from public funds.

Abolition of Slavery.—The British prohibition of the slave trade in 1807, followed by the condemnation of the traffic by the Congress of Vienna in 1815 (*ante*, p. 310), involved the ultimate abolition of slavery itself within the British Empire. After many years of discussion Lord Grey who had carried the Reform Bill, succeeded in passing (1833) an Act for the total abolition of slavery in the British colonies, and the payment of twenty millions sterling to the planters as compensation. The actual final liberation of the slaves took place in 1838.

Slavery in India.—Slavery in different forms had existed in most parts of India from time immemorial. Since the passing of the Indian Act V of 1843 by Lord Ellenborough's Government no court in British India is allowed to recognize the existence of slavery. Every human being in British India is free in the eye of the law, whatever may be his position in practice. No compensation was paid to Indian slave owners, and no formal manumission or grant of freedom to individuals

took place, the Act simply declared that in future no person would be regarded as a slave by the law. So far back as 1772 Lord Chief Justice Mansfield had ruled in Somerset's case that as soon as a slave set his foot on the soil of the British Isles he became free. Since 1843 that is the law of British India also^o.

Lord William Bentinck in India.—The successor of Lord Amherst (*ante*, p 313) as Governor General of India was Lord William Bentinck, who for seven years of nearly unbroken peace (1828–35) was able to devote himself almost exclusively to internal reforms. The best known of his measures is the Regulation, passed in 1829, declaring that 'the practice of suttee, or burning or burying alive the widows of Hindus [is] illegal and punishable by the Criminal Courts'. His Government also succeeded in suppressing almost completely the terrible system of thuggee (*thagi*)—the practice of wholesale strangling for the sake of plunder by armed gangs. Lord William, acting in concert with Macaulay, the first Law Member of Council, came to the 'momentous decision' to make English the official and literary language of the country. Many other measures of administrative reform are associated with the name of Lord William Bentinck, 'whose constant study it was to elevate the intellectual and moral character of the nation committed to his charge'.

He also did much to improve communication with Europe by the Red Sea route, which Warren Hastings had not been allowed to establish (*ante* p 272), and conferred a great benefit on the Empire by making Singapore, acquired from the Dutch in 1824, the capital of the Straits Settlements, and so enabling it to become the important imperial naval station and port which it now is.

Changes of Ministry—Disputes about Irish Church funds and other matters led to the resignation of Lord Grey in 1834. His place was taken by Lord Melbourne, but after a few months that minister was dismissed by King William. The incident is remarkable as being the last occasion on which a ministry

has been changed simply at the will of the sovereign¹ Queen Victoria always chose her Prime Minister in accordance with the expressed will of the House of Commons. After dismissing Lord Melbourne the king summoned Sir Robert Peel, but when he proved unable to secure a majority in the House of Commons the king had to take Lord Melbourne back again (1835), and he continued to be Prime Minister during the early years of the next reign.

Death of William IV.—In June 1837 King William died, at the age of 68. Like his brother George IV, he left no legitimate issue, so the crown passed to his niece, the Princess Victoria, a girl of 18, daughter of the king's brother, the Duke of Kent, who had died in 1820. Her reign of 63½ years the longest in English history will occupy our attention for the next two chapters, but before entering upon the consideration of the Victorian Age, it will be well to pause and mark some of the changes which made the England of Queen Victoria so different from that of her grandfather.

Revolutions and Literature—Great thoughts beget great books and great books have much to do with the origin of revolutions in religion, politics and social life. The French Revolution was the fruit, not only of the misgovernment of France (*ante* p. 284) but of the fertile ideas sown by Voltaire and other French authors, the germs of which are to be found in the works of John Locke and his British fellow thinkers.² Revolutions when once started tend to produce high thinking which must find expression in literature, art and other ways.

¹ The king regarded as a resignation the letter in which Melbourne wrote "Viscount Melbourne earnestly entreats that no personal consideration for him may prevent your Majesty from taking any measures or seeking any other advice which your Majesty may think more likely to conduce to your Majesty's service and the advantage of the country. But Melbourne apparently did not intend to resign."

² Locke's works, the *Essay concerning Human Understanding* (1690), *Letter on Toleration*, *Treatises on Government* &c. became widely known in Europe through Le Clerc's *Bibliothèque Universelle*. The first named has gone through forty editions besides translations.

Thus the supremely excellent literature of the Shakespearian Age was intimately connected both as cause and effect with the manifold religious, political, and social activities of the period

Mental Activity of the Nineteenth Century.—The same thing happened at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The minds of men had been quickened, as it were, by the breath of the Spirit of Life and their surging thoughts found utterance in almost every department of human activity—in science, fine art literature, social improvement, political reform, and the art of war. Religion alone was not deeply affected by the upheaval which began with the storming of the Bastille (*ante*, p 285). The furious attack made by the early French Revolutionists on all things sacred soon spent its force, and when Napoleon attained absolute power he gave his protection to the Church. In England the revival of spiritual life brought about by the Wesleys and their associates (*ante*, p 254) had been effected before the outbreak of the Revolutionary War. The later revival in a different direction known as the Oxford Movement, began many years after the peace. During the first forty years of the nineteenth century the depths of religious emotion were rarely stirred in Great Britain.

The Art of War—The chief political reforms and social improvements of the time have been briefly noticed. The art of war is a subject too technical for discussion in these pages, and we can merely mention the fact that Napoleon, Wellington, and Nelson all contributed to it novel and fruitful ideas. No student of naval and military affairs can afford to neglect the Napoleonic wars.

Fine Art; Turner—In the fine arts the period is made illustrious by the name of J M W Turner, the hero of *Modern Painters* the most elaborate work of Ruskin himself an artist of genius. Turner is considered by some critics to be the most eminent of the world's landscape painters and it is certain that his water colour drawings are unsurpassed. He also founded an admirable school of engravers on steel,

whose charming art, alas, is now all but dead in the United Kingdom—killed by photography It still lingers on the Continent

Literature.—English literature of the early years of the nineteenth century will bear comparison with that of any age in any country Poetry shook itself free from the formal conventional style of the eighteenth century imitators of Pope returning to sincerity and nature Wordsworth, Coleridge, Sir Walter Scott, Keats, Byron, and Shelley then produced a mass of verse original in thought, language, and metre much of which will endure as long as the English tongue shall be read or spoken Among the poets named he who has wielded the most potent influence is Wordsworth, who saw ‘into the life of things’ as far as mortal man has ever seen

We have no space even to name the many lesser poets or the writers of admirable prose, and can only note that Scott’s wondrous series of *Waverley Novels* all appeared in the short interval between 1814 and 1831

Scientific Discovery—Modern science may be said with little inaccuracy to have its beginning in the nineteenth century Almost all the earlier scientific books seem to belong to a world different from ours For instance, William Smith, who published in 1815 the first geological map of England, Wales, and part of Scotland, is justly deemed to be ‘the father of English geology’,¹ and all books on the subject published before his time are practically worthless The close study of nature soon made itself felt in the application of the knowledge so gained to the affairs of daily life The first British steamboat began to ply on the Clyde in 1812, and the first railway for passengers was opened in 1825 The

¹ Geology is the science which treats of the history and structure of the globe itself, including the origin and succession of the layers of rock, and the description of the ‘fossils’ or remains of animals and plants of bygone ages, which lie buried in the rocks. A *adligram* is a fossil ammonite, a sea-shell turned into stone.

electric telegraph as a means of business communication may be dated from 1835, when the Morse system of signalling was invented in America. If we consider how strange the world would seem without railways, steamships and telegraphs, we may realize how different the England of Queen Victoria was from that of George III. The inventive skill which created steam-engines and telegraph systems was equally active in hundreds of other directions, so that during the nineteenth century the material progress made was greater than that achieved in all the ages that had gone before. How far mankind is really better or happier for such progress is a question to which the answer of the East may not always be the same as that current in the West.

LEADING DATES

Treaty of Paris	Nov 1815
Distress in England	1816
Pindari and Third Maratha Wars	1817-1818
Accession of George IV	1820
First passenger railway opened	1825
First Burmese War	1826
Resignation of Lord Liverpool, short ministries of Mr Canning and Lord Goderich, battle of Navarino	1827
Duke of Wellington Prime Minister	1828
Lord William Bentinck Governor General of India	1828-35
Catholic Relief Act	1829
Accession of William IV	June 1830
Resignation of Duke of Wellington, Lord Grey Prime Minister	Nov 1830
Reform Act	1832
Abolition of slavery in the colonies	1833
New Poor Law, first short ministry of Lord Melbourne	
Sir Robert Peel Prime Minister	1834
Second ministry of Lord Melbourne	1835
Death of William IV	June 1837

CHAPTER XXIV

THE REIGN OF QUEEN VICTORIA, FROM 1837 TO THE
OUTBREAK OF THE CRIMEAN WAR, 1854 *

Severance from Hanover.—The troublesome connexion with Hanover was happily broken by the accession to the throne of England of a female sovereign, who, according to law, could not succeed in Hanover. King William's eldest surviving brother, Ernest Duke of Cumberland, became King of Hanover, and in due course was followed by his son, whose Government joined Austria in 1866 and shared the defeat of that power by Prussia. The penalty of defeat was the annexation of his kingdom by Prussia.



QUEEN VICTORIA AS A CHILD

Princess Victoria learned that she had become Queen of England may be best related in the simple language of her *Journal* —

Accession of Queen Victoria —The curious details of the manner in which

‘Tuesday, 20th June, 1837 —I was awoke at 6 o'clock by Mamma, who told me that the Archbishop of Canterbury and Lord Conyngham were here, and wished to see me. I got out of bed and went into my sitting room (only in my dressing gown) and *alone*, and saw them. Lord Conyngham (the Lord Chamberlain) then acquainted me that my poor

uncle, the King, was no more, and had expired at 12 minutes past 2 this morning, and consequently that I am *Queen*. Lord Conyngham knelt down and kissed my hand, at the same time delivering to me the official announcement of the poor King's demise. . . . I then went to my room and dressed.

Since it has pleased Providence to place me in this station I shall do my utmost to fulfil my duty towards my country ; I am very young and perhaps in many, though not in all things, inexperienced, but I am sure that very few have more real goodwill and more real desire to do what is fit and right than I have.'

When Queen Victoria, after a reign of sixty-three years, followed her uncle to the grave, the whole world was ready to testify that she had acted up to the promise made by the girl of eighteen, and had tried to do her duty. Like other people she made mistakes, but nobody could ever doubt the intensity of Her late Majesty's 'desire to do what is fit and right.'

Difficulties of the Queen.—The queen had been, as she wrote herself, 'brought up very simply,' and had been purposely kept away from Court, the manners of which, in the time of her uncles, were open to much objection. She had consequently seen little of the world, and, although sufficiently well read, had much to learn. The defects in the characters of George IV and William IV had shaken the popular feeling of loyalty and lowered the respect in which the sovereign should be held. The ministry of Lord Melbourne was not qualified to win respect for itself. The Prime Minister, who was reputed to be without fixed political convictions, affected a levity of manner which made people think that he only played with the *serious business* of government. He was, therefore, unpopular, and was held to be answerable for the severe distress prevailing at that time among the working classes, who were disgusted to find that the Reform Act of 1832 had done little for them. The Government passed several useful measures dealing with education, the abuses of children's labour, penny postage (1840), and other important matters, but always seemed to act unwillingly

and under pressure, not of its own motion. Thus the young queen was placed in a position of great difficulty, being dependent for guidance on a minister who did not command public confidence.

Marriage of the Queen.—She naturally felt the need of support, and so gave her confidence in matters of State to Lord Melbourne, who settled down into the position, in practice, of tutor and private secretary, in addition to his official business as Prime Minister. Certain unlucky incidents involved the queen in the unpopularity of her minister, and she did not fully win the love of her subjects until some time after her marriage. She chose as her consort her cousin, Prince Albert of Saxe-Coburg, in Germany, whom she married in 1840. The union proved to be most happy, and Prince Albert, or, as he was later called, the Prince Consort, soon became the queen's wise and rightly trusted adviser. He was a man of the highest character, and was most careful to avoid taking a prominent part in politics. But he had the disadvantage of being a foreigner, and was never as popular as he should have been on his merits. Throughout the reign, from first to last, the Court was regulated on the strictest moral principles and in that respect presented a marked contrast to the Courts of George IV and William IV. The Queen, as the mother of a large family, set her subjects an example of well-ordered domestic life, which earned for her in old age the title of 'mother of her people', with whose joys and sorrows she always showed lively sympathy, as for those of her children.

Chartism.—The early years of Queen Victoria's reign were much troubled both at home and abroad. The distress of the labouring classes produced a movement called Chartism, because the leaders asked for the grant of six things which they called the People's Charter. They wanted universal suffrage, that is to say, that every grown man should have a vote in elections of members of Parliament. That demand, although not yet fully conceded, has been met in large part by the later Reform Acts. The next proposal, that for annual

parliaments, meant a request that a general election should be held every year, and a *fresh House of Commons* chosen. The effect of such a measure would be most mischievous, and nowadays nobody asks for it. Under the provisions of the Septennial Act (1716) no Parliament could last for more than seven years (*ante*, p 246). The Parliament Act (1911) has reduced the term to five years, which in practice will mean a general election at least once in four years, quite often enough. General elections cost a great deal of money and upset the country very much. The third request, that people should be allowed to vote by ballot at parliamentary elections, was accepted in 1872. The effect is that a voter need not let any one know how he votes, and that he is thus freed, if he chooses to be freed from the pressure or influence applied by other people. Since the ballot was introduced elections are much quieter than they used to be. The fourth demand was that members of Parliament should no longer be required to possess a considerable amount of property, so that poor men might be elected as members. That has been silently conceded. The fifth proposal that members of Parliament should be paid salaries was made law in 1911, and members now draw £400 a year each. Many thoughtful people of all parties believe that the change will be injurious. The sixth demand that the country should be cut up into equal electoral districts so that each member of Parliament should represent exactly so many thousand people is not likely to be granted in full although all modern measures of parliamentary reform tend to make electoral districts less unequal than they have been¹.

The Chartists made the common mistake of thinking that changes in the mere machinery of government would make people better and happier. In reality, if every one of the six demands had been granted seventy years ago, the country,

¹ At present (1911) the extreme cases are the Romford division of Essex with 52 984 voters, and Kilkenny (Ireland) with 1 742 voters. Each returns one member of Parliament.

in all probability, would have been worse off, rather than better. The Chartist agitation produced many disturbances and lasted until 1848.

The Corn-Laws.—The distress of the poor was partly due to the high price of corn caused by the heavy customs duty levied on grain coming from abroad. Landowners and farmers grew rich from pocketing the high prices, while other people who paid them grew poorer. In some ways the corn-laws, as they were called, were of benefit, but on the whole the evils produced by them outweighed the good, and the *heavy* duties were rightly repealed. Many modern politicians think that a *light* duty on foreign corn should be levied, and can give good reasons of their opinion, but the memory of the suffering of the poor in the days of the old corn-laws is still so vivid, that a strong aversion to any tax which might possibly make bread dearer is widely felt. An Anti Corn-Law League formed in 1838 never rested from its labours until Sir Robert Peel was persuaded to change his opinions and allow the desired repeal in 1846. Mr John Bright and Mr Richard Cobden, both excellent speakers in different styles, led the agitation. The general discontent during the first four years of the queen's reign was increased by Lord Melbourne's mismanagement of the finances of the country, the expenditure of which constantly exceeded the income.

Rebellion in Canada.—Affairs abroad were no brighter than those at home. In Canada disputes between the French population of Quebec or Lower Canada, and the more recently formed British settlements in Upper Canada, farther west, resulted in a small rebellion, which was quickly suppressed. Lord Durham, who was sent out to arrange matters, wrote a valuable Report, which has been used as the basis of the present Canadian constitution, but acted in a manner so high-handed that the Cabinet had to recall him. It has been said that 'Lord Durham made a country and marred a career. The mission of Lord Durham saved Canada. It ruined Lord Durham'. He died at an early age in 1840.

War with China.—The war with China (1840-2) cannot be remembered with satisfaction. After the trade in the China Seas had been thrown open to all comers, in 1833, the traffic in opium, which the East India Company had done much to promote, continued to attract private merchants. The company's control having been abolished, the Home Government sent out Captain (Admiral Sir Charles) Elliot to Canton as Superintendent of Trade. The Chinese Government strongly objected to the importation of opium. Captain Elliot agreed to stop it, and gave up more than 20,000 chests of the drug, worth an immense sum, to be burnt. This submission, however, did not satisfy the Chinese officials, who despised the traders and were utterly ignorant of European strength. They made demands which the English could not stand, and in 1840 war was declared. The Chinese troops, who were unable to resist European arms, were easily defeated, with the result that China ceded the island of Hongkong to England, opened several ports to trade, opium traffic included, and agreed to pay an indemnity of nearly six millions sterling (1842). The practical effect of the war having been to force opium on the unwilling Chinese Government, the policy pursued has always been open to attack and difficult to defend. At the present time (1911) friendly agreements are in progress for gradually stopping the export of opium from India to China. The Government of China seems to be in earnest in desiring to suppress the use of the drug, while the English and Indian Governments feel that they cannot with a clear conscience go on forcing opium on the Chinese. The change of policy means to India a heavy money loss, the restriction of poppy cultivation, and probably the ultimate abolition of the Opium Department.

Hongkong, to which some adjoining territory has been added by later treaties, has proved to be a most valuable possession. The town, properly called Victoria, is now one of the richest ports in the East, strongly fortified, and with a population of more than 166,000.

Syrian War.—Another little war arose from the resolve of

Lord Palmerston, the masterful Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, to prevent the Pasha of Egypt from keeping Syria, which he had taken from Turkey. The Pasha was supposed to be backed by France. A combined fleet of English, Austrian, and Turkish ships bombarded Acre, and the Pasha had to go (1841). At one time it looked as if the affair might cause war between England and France.

First Afghan War.—In India Lord Auckland, the Governor-General who took over charge in 1836, became alarmed at intrigues between Dost Muhammad, Amir of Afghanistan, and the Russians. He resolved accordingly to expel Dost Muhammad and replace him by Shah Shuja, a claimant to the throne who had been living in British territory. That policy was carried out. Ghazni and Kandahar were taken, Kabul was occupied, and Shah Shuja was placed on the throne (1839). But the Afghans would not accept him. They rose, murdered Sir William Macnaghten, the British Envoy, and drove the English out of Kabul. The army of occupation, having the ill luck to be commanded by an incapable general, was utterly destroyed (1842) excepting about 120 prisoners and a single officer, Dr Brydon, who made his way into the fort at Jalalabad, which held out under General Sale. The disaster was the most severe which has ever befallen an Anglo-Indian army. Everybody is now agreed that Lord Auckland's policy was mistaken and that both the Envoy and the commanders of the army of occupation made terrible blunders, which they paid for with their lives.

Sir Robert Peel Prime Minister.—Before the final ruin in Afghanistan Lord Melbourne's Government had deservedly fallen, owing to a hostile resolution of the House of Commons, carried by a single vote (June 1841). A general election followed, and Sir Robert Peel, leader of the Tory or Conservative party, became Prime Minister, supported by a large majority in the House of Commons.

Peace with China and Kābul.—Peace was made with China. Lord Auckland was superseded by Lord Ellenborough, the

Kabul disaster was avenged, and the troops were withdrawn from Afghanistan. Unfortunately, Lord Ellenborough made himself ridiculous by issuing silly proclamations and carrying about the sham 'gates of Somnath'.

Conquest of Sind (Seinde); Mahārājpur.—In 1843 Lord Ellenborough and Sir Charles Napier purposely picked a quarrel with the Amirs of Sind, who were accused on slight grounds of unfriendly conduct during the Afghan war. The Amirs' troops having been defeated at Miani near Hyderabad, and in other fights, Sind was annexed to the Bombay Presidency. It is impossible to defend the justice of the war. Lord Ellenborough also treated the Government of the Gwalior State, or Sindia's Dominions, in a high handed fashion, but, perhaps, with better reason. The battles of Maharajpur and Panar (December 1843) settled that the Gwalior State must acknowledge the paramount British power. The Governor-General was contented with that result and abstained from annexing territory. The ruler of Gwalior has been loyal ever since though some of the soldiers of the State joined the rebels in the Mutiny. In 1844 Lord Ellenborough was recalled by the Court of Directors, and a better man Sir Henry (Lord) Hardinge, father of the present Viceroy (1911) was sent in his place. Although the queen disapproved of Lord Ellenborough's recall and held that he was hardly used, the final judgement of history will, I think, support the action of the Directors.

First Sikh War.—Sir Henry Hardinge, like most of his predecessors, went out to India to find war while seeking peace. It will be convenient to notice the Sikh Wars and the Second Burmese War in this place. Mahārāja Ranjit Singh, the head of the Sikh Confederacy, remained faithful to the British alliance through his life. When he died in 1839 nobody in the Panjab was fit to take his place, and the army got out of control. In December 1845 the Sikh chiefs declared war by leading a strong force of 60 000 men across the Sutlej the frontier settled by Lord Minto in 1809. The Governor-

General had no choice but to fight. Within two months (December 1845 to February 1846) four hardly contested battles were fought—at Mudki (Moodkee), Ferozeshah (Pharushahr), Aliwal, and Sohraon—in all of which the British forces were victorious. Sir Henry Hardinge and his Commander in-Chief, Sir Hugh Gough, received well-deserved peerages, and makeshift arrangements were made for the government of the Panjab which the Governor General was not then prepared to annex.

Second Sikh War.—Those makeshift arrangements soon broke down. A revolt, begun at Multan, quickly spread over the whole province, and Lord Dalhousie, Lord Hardinge's brilliant successor, was forced to engage in a life or death struggle with the formidable Sikh power. The bloody fight at Chillianwala was almost a drawn battle, but a decisive victory gained by Lord Gough at Gujrat on February 21, 1849, ended the war and resulted in the annexation of the Panjab, whose gallant sons only eight years later, helped to plant the British flag in triumph on the citadel of rebel Delhi.

Second Burmese War.—Lord Amherst's First Burmese War (*ante*, p. 313), had added Assam, Arakan, and Tenasserim to the Indian Empire. The Second Burmese War, provoked by Burmese arrogance, and admirably managed by Lord Dalhousie, ended in the annexation of the province of Pegu, so that the Burman Kingdom was completely shut out from the sea (1852).

Home Affairs; Sir Robert Peel's Finance.—It is now time to come home from the East and see how history was being made in the United Kingdom and Europe.

Sir Robert Peel who understood moneymatters and political economy, was gradually changing his old opinions and coming to see that the country was injured by the excessive customs duties charged on imports, not only of corn, but of other things. The new policy took effect in his Budget of 1842, which repealed many customs duties and imposed a moderate income tax. During the Napoleonic wars the income tax—

sometimes as high as 10 per cent —had been levied as a special war tax. It was withdrawn at the end of 1815, when peace was assured, and was now revived by Sir Robert Peel as part of the ordinary resources of the Government in a time of peace. The Budgets of three years following were constructed on similar lines. The minister's measures placed the finance of the country on a sound footing, and enabled him to pass the Bank Act of 1844, which regulated the relations between the State and the Bank of England and prescribed limits for the issue of paper currency or bank-notes. The subject is too technical for further notice here.

Irish Affairs; O Connell and Repeal—The impulse which determined Peel's final change of opinions and brought about the repeal of the corn laws came from Ireland, of which the affairs must now engage the reader's attention. In 1841 the agitation for the Repeal of the Union, that is to say, for the establishment of a separate, independent Irish Parliament, was revived. The leader in the agitation was Daniel O Connell, an eloquent barrister who had done much in carrying the Catholic Relief Act of 1829. He now took up the Repeal question vigorously, and began to assemble huge meetings throughout the island which he was able to control at will by means of his wondrous gift of oratory. He did not wish to sever the connexion with England altogether, or to encourage crime, but as a matter of fact the excitement kept up by constant agitation produced much serious crime. O Connell, as Mr Justin McCarthy observes 'deliberately revived and worked up for his political purposes the almost extinct national hatreds of Celt and Saxon'. By that action he lost the goodwill of England and did his own country an injury of which the effects are felt to this day. His meetings became dangerous to public order, so that the Government found it necessary to prohibit a mass meeting to be held at Clontarf, near Dublin, in October 1843. O Connell submitted to the order. Next year he was condemned for sedition, but on appeal was acquitted by the House of Lords.

His power, however, was gone, and for the moment the Repeal agitation was killed. But trouble in Ireland still continued.

The Irish Famine.—The introduction of potato cultivation into Ireland by Sir Walter Raleigh (*ante* p. 174) at first sight a blessing proved to be a curse. During the eighteenth century the people formed the habit of relying for food wholly on the easily grown potato, and thousands of families rarely tasted anything else¹. The population grew larger than the land could support properly so that in 1845 it exceeded eight and a quarter millions about double what it is now. The failure of the potato crops in 1845 produced an awful famine, which lasted more or less until 1847. Charity in both Great Britain and Ireland did what it could while the Government started relief works and doles of cooked food, but experience in famine administration was lacking and the relief was very imperfect. The suffering was horrible, and by the time the famine was over starvation disease and emigration had reduced the population by at least two millions. The Irish famine was the immediate cause of the repeal of the corn laws which Peel succeeded in carrying in 1846. He honestly avowed his change of opinion and had the courage to act accordingly. He was bitterly attacked by Mr Disraeli, afterwards Earl of Beaconsfield who now for the first time took a prominent part in politics. Soon afterwards a combination of parties defeated the ministry on a bill for the preservation of order in Ireland and Peel resigned (June 1846). Four years later he was killed by a fall from his horse. No English statesman has left behind him a more honourable reputation for honesty in every sense of the word and unselfish love of his country.

Lord John Russell and Palmerston; Napoleon III.—Lord John Russell leader of the Whig or Liberal party, became Prime Minister with Lord Palmerston as Secretary of State.

¹ A terrible famine due to the same cause as that of 1845 had occurred in 1739-40 and is said to have destroyed one-fifth of the population.

for Foreign Affairs. The year 1848 has been called 'the year of unfulfilled revolutions'. France got rid of King Louis Philippe, and though that revolution seemed to be successful, it really was 'unfulfilled'. In three years it ended in the despotism of Louis Napoleon, the great Napoleon's nephew, who seized power in 1851, and was proclaimed in 1852 as Emperor of the French, under the title of Napoleon III.¹ In Hungary and other countries on the Continent various attempts at revolution failed. Lord Palmerston was dismissed from office for rashly expressing his approval of Louis Napoleon's usurpation without consulting the queen or even the Prime Minister (December 1851). When in charge of foreign affairs Lord Palmerston resolutely upheld the name and honour of England, but he was too ready to meddle in other people's affairs and too much disposed to use rude language to other powers.

The Aberdeen Coalition Ministry; Dreams of Peace.—Early in 1852 Lord John Russell, having been defeated in the House of Commons, resigned. Lord Derby then held office for a short time, and was succeeded by Lord Aberdeen as Prime Minister, with Palmerston as Home Secretary. Lord John Russell took the Foreign Office, and Mr Gladstone became Chancellor of the Exchequer. The ministry was a coalition of nearly all the cleverest politicians of the day, and yet a terrible failure. At that time a generation had grown up in England which knew not what war was. In 1851 Prince Albert had organized a great International Exhibition in Hyde Park, and men dreamed dreams of universal peace, fancying that wars were ended and that nations had nothing to do but buy and sell the wares sampled in the Exhibition. So now (1911) sentimental people talk of universal arbitration and dream similar dreams. But before long the hard facts of waking life will shiver the glass houses of the dreamers as they

¹ The Duke of Reichstadt in Austria, the great emperor's son who died in 1832 was reckoned as Napoleon II by the Bonapartists. Of course, he never reigned.

did in the time of the clever men of the Aberdeen Ministry, who drifted helplessly into a series of wars before they knew where they were

Beginning of the Crimean War.—A trumpety quarrel between members of the Latin and Greek Churches over the holy places at Jerusalem was the spark which fired the powder. In due course Turkey declared war against Russia, and lost her fleet in a battle at Sinope on the southern shore of the Black Sea (November 1853). Three months later France and England had joined Turkey against Russia and the Crimean War had begun, much to the surprise of Lord Aberdeen, and to the satisfaction of Lord Palmerston.

The allies resolved to attack the Russian fortress of Sebastopol in the Crimea, a peninsula in the south of Russia jutting out into the Black Sea. The allied armies landed in September 1854 and presently won the battle of the Alma river. If that success had been followed by vigorous action, the war apparently might have been quickly ended, but that did not happen and the English nation had to pay a heavy penalty for having enjoyed forty years of slothful peace and eager money getting. The new period which began with the Crimean War must be treated in a separate chapter. But the events of that period are too numerous and recent to be treated in detail and a very rapid survey alone will be possible.

LEADING DATES

Accession of Queen Victoria	separation from Hanover	. 1837
Canadian rebellion	"	1839
Wars with China and Afghanistan	"	1839-42
Marriage of the Queen		1840
Sir Robert Peel Prime Minister		. 1841
Loss of army of occupation in Afghanistan		1842
Battle of Miani and conquest of Sind (Scinde), battle of Maharajpur		1843
Battle of Sohraon, ending First Sikh War	recall of Lord Ellenborough	
Sir H. Hardinge Governor-General		1844
Irish famine		1845-7
Repeal of Corn Laws, Lord John Russell Prime Minister		. 1846

Battle of Gujrat (Second Sikh War); annexation of the Panjab	1849
Second Burmese War, short ministry of Lord Derby, Lord Aberdeen Prime Minister, Napoleon III, Emperor of the French	1852
Beginning of Crimean War, battle of the Alma	1854

CHAPTER XXV

THE REIGN OF QUEEN VICTORIA FROM 1854 TO 1901

Siege of Sebastopol.—The siege of Sebastopol lasted until September 1855, when the Russians were forced to quit the town, which they set on fire. In the interval the allies had won the fiercely fought battles of Balaclava and Inkermann. Balaclava is famous for the charge of the Light Brigade of English cavalry, some 600 strong against the whole Russian army. Only one third came back.


‘Forward the Light Brigade’
 Was there a man dismayed?
 Not though the soldier knew
 Some one had blundered
 Theirs not to make reply,
 Theirs not to reason why,
 Theirs but to do and die
 Into the valley of Death
 Rode the six hundred (TENNYSON)

Inkermann, fought in a thick, dark mist, is called ‘the soldiers’ battle’ because the generals had little to do with it.

Peace of Paris (1856); Lord Palmerston Prime Minister.—Throughout the siege the generalship on the side of the allies was poor, and infinite suffering was caused to the English troops by the failure of the authorities at home to supply them properly. During forty years of peace the art of war had been forgotten and nobody in England knew how to maintain an army in the field. The wrath of the nation found voice in the House of Commons which by a hostile vote drove the Aberdeen Ministry from office (1855). Lord Palmerston then became

Prime Minister and things were better managed. In 1856 another Peace of Paris closed the war. Russia was checked by the exclusion of ships of war from the Black Sea, a rule which she obeyed until 1870, when she felt strong enough to break it. Various other agreements were made, England, France, and Austria by a separate treaty promising to main-

THE CAMPAIGN IN THE CRIMEA



tain the independence of Turkey. The main object of the war, so far as England was concerned, was to keep Russia out of Constantinople and that was attained.

Second War with China — A little war with China was started in consequence of the seizure by the Chinese authorities of a small vessel called the *Arrow*, flying the British flag which the Chinese maintained was not really a British boat. The violent proceedings of the British officers in China were condemned by Parliament, but Lord Palmerston approved.

them and appealed to the patriotic feeling of the country by dissolving Parliament. At the general election which followed he obtained a good majority. Canton was taken in 1857, and the Emperor of China agreed to receive at his court ambassadors from England and other states. But, in 1859 when the embassies wanted to go to Peking the capital in order to ratify the treaties, the Chinese fired on them. In the end the Chinese were beaten and the European troops occupied Peking. From that time (1860) China has had to be content to receive ambassadors from the governments of Europe and to send her own ambassadors to London and other capitals.

War with Persia—Another little war was caused in 1856 by the Persians seizing Herat which was then regarded as 'the key of India'. An expedition commanded by Sir James Outram defeated the Persians and compelled them to give up Herat.

The Indian Mutiny—Meantime far more serious trouble had arisen by the outbreak of the Indian Mutiny in May 1857 at a time when the British garrison was dangerously weak and England was supposed to be much enfeebled by the strain of the Crimean, Chinese and Persian wars. Lord Canning the Governor General luckily, was able to stop some troops on their way to China and to recall the expedition in Persia. Their arrival taught the mutineers that England was stronger than they supposed. The story of the Mutiny—the gallant defence of the Lucknow Residency by a small garrison of British and a few brave Indian soldiers true to their salt, the horrors of Cawnpore, the capture of Delhi, the fight made by the Rani of Jhansi, the best 'man' among the rebels, and all the other incidents of those stirring times—cannot be told here. The turning point of the struggle was the taking of Delhi in September 1857 when the Mogul dynasty came to an inglorious end and the close of the disturbances was marked by the execution in April 1859 of Tantia Topi, the rebel leader in Central India. Most of the fighting was over in 1858.

India under the Crown.—The crash of the Mutiny brought down the rule of the East India Company. The nation felt that the time had come for taking over the government of India as a national and imperial concern. Accordingly, an Act for the better government of India transferred to the Queen as from September 1, 1858 the government of the territories 'heretofore administered in trust' for Her Majesty by the Honourable East India Company. The nobly expressed Proclamation in which Queen Victoria announced the change was read by Lord Canning in a great Durbar held at Allahabad in November 1858. It closes with these words —

'When by the blessing of Providence, internal tranquillity shall be restored it is our earnest desire to stimulate the peaceful industry of India, to promote works of public utility and improvement, and to administer the government for the benefit of all our subjects resident therein. In their prosperity will be our strength, in their contentment our security, and in their gratitude our best reward. And may the God of all power grant to us, and to those in authority under us strength to carry out these our wishes for the good of our people.'

Successive Sovereigns Secretaries of State, Viceroys, and their officers without exception have tried to fulfil the Queen's ideal. Although they may not always have been able to ensure prosperity, establish contentment or win gratitude, they have invariably sought the well being of India. Critics who are disposed to resent partial ill success may reasonably be required to point out how or by whom the heavy task could have been better or as well accomplished. It is not given to man to command perfect success in all the details of an undertaking so vast as the government of 315 millions of people especially when those millions differ so widely in race religion language manners, and customs both from their foreign rulers and from each other as do those of India. But the British Government may fairly claim to have attained such measure of success as the conditions permit and to have tried its utmost to live up to a high ideal. About the time that this

volume will be published, His Gracious Majesty, the King-Emperor, George V, will be giving in the face of the world proof of his deep concern for the welfare of his Indian subjects by visiting them in person, accompanied by his Consort, receiving their loyal homage, and bestowing in return the grace of his imperial favour

His Majesty, after the solemnity of the Coronation, when thanking his people for their hearty display of affectionate loyalty, was pleased to use words which may be applied specially to India —

‘Believing’ His Majesty declares, ‘that this generous and outspoken sympathy with the Queen and myself is, under God, our surest source of strength, I am encouraged to go forward with renewed hope. Whatever perplexities or difficulties may lie before me and my people we shall all unite in facing them resolutely, calmly, and with public spirit, confident that, under Divine guidance, the ultimate outcome will be to the common good’

If the princes and peoples of India meet His Majesty in the same spirit, India may hope for much good

The First Viceroy of India.—The change in the relation between the Sovereign and the Government of India was marked by the bestowal on the Governor General of the title of Viceroy. Lord Canning the first Viceroy, gave up his life for his country. Worn out by six years of unceasing toil and crushing responsibility, he came home to die, as his great predecessor, Lord Dalhousie had done

Changes of Ministers.—Lord Palmerston, who seemed to be so firmly seated in power, fell unexpectedly in February 1858. The occasion was a bill to amend the law of conspiracy to murder, brought in on account of an attempt to murder the Emperor of the French made by an Italian named Orsini who had planned the conspiracy in England. The notion got abroad that the Prime Minister was truckling to the Emperor of the French, thinking of his wishes rather than of the interests of England. That feeling was expressed by the House of Commons in a hostile vote and Palmerston had to

resign. He was succeeded by Lord Derby, a Conservative, whose Chancellor of the Exchequer was Mr. Disraeli. The new Ministry did not last long, and, after a general election, made way again for a Liberal Ministry. Once more Lord Palmerston became Prime Minister (1859), and he retained office until his death six years later. •

The Volunteers.—At that time it was generally believed that the Emperor of the French had the intention of invading England. The belief, whether well or ill founded, led to the formation of a large Volunteer force, no less than 170,000 men joining it in the year 1859. Within the last few years the force has been reorganized as the Territorial Army, intended primarily for the defence of the United Kingdom, not for foreign service.

War between France and Austria—In the same year (1859) the French went to war with Austria in order to free Italy from the rule of that power and won several battles. The Emperor of the French, afraid of the growing strength of Prussia, stayed his hand and was content with freeing Lombardy or Northern Italy, which was made over to the King of Sardinia, who was obliged to cede Savoy and Nice to France.

American Civil War—The Civil War, or War of Secession, in the United States, one of the fiercest wars in history, broke out in 1861. The Southern States, Carolina and the rest, where negro slaves were numerous, resisted the agitation going on in the Northern States for the abolition of slavery, and took the extreme step of seceding or withdrawing from federal union with the North, thus breaking up the United States into two separate nations¹. At first the Southern States were

¹ A federal union is one in which several States, each governing itself, combine voluntarily for certain common purposes under a Federal Government which is sovereign so far as those purposes are concerned. Besides the United States of America, the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, and Switzerland offer examples of such unions. The Northerners were called Federals because they upheld the principle of federal union and denied the right of individual States to secede. For the sake of distinction the Southerners called themselves Confederates.

victorious, but, after a hard fight, they were beaten by the larger population and greater wealth of the North. The war ended in May 1865, by the complete victory of the Federal Northerners. The Union of the States was maintained and slavery was abolished.

Death of the Prince Consort.—In the first year of the war the Queen and her country suffered a severe loss by the unexpected death of the Prince Consort at the age of forty two, after a short illness. He had lived long enough to survive the prejudices and suspicions which had formerly made him unpopular, and when he died the Queen had the heartfelt sympathy of the whole nation. He had devoted himself specially to the intelligent patronage of art and science, and as the Queen's husband had been to her an unfailing support. Her Majesty, to the end of her long life never ceased to mourn her Consort.

Seizure of 'Confederate' Envoys.—The American war had important consequences for England. The violent seizure by a Northern captain of two envoys from the Southern or 'Confederate' States on board of a British vessel in which they were passengers nearly led to war between the United Kingdom and the United States. But the Americans were so clearly in the wrong that they could not help apologizing and giving up the prisoners.

The 'Alabama'.—England long before had abolished both the slave trade and slavery itself within the Empire. It might have been expected therefore, that English sympathy would have been with the North rather than with the South. But, as a matter of fact, the favour of the English nation was generally given, for reasons which we have not space to discuss, to the Southerners not to the Northerners, and to some extent the ministers shared that feeling. The government of Lord Palmerston failed to prevent a privateer ship the *Alabama*, built at Liverpool for the Confederates, from going to sea. When she got out, after a belated attempt to detain her, she did immense damage to Federal trading ships until she was

sunk by an American man of war off the French coast. Years afterwards the complaints on the subject were referred to a court of arbitration, which awarded the United States excessive damages against England (1872).

The Lancashire 'Cotton Famine'.—Another serious consequence of the war was the 'cotton famine' in Lancashire. The mill owners of Manchester and the other factory towns of the north of England had been accustomed to trust to the *Southern or Confederate States for their supply of cotton*. That supply being nearly altogether stopped by the war the mills could not go on and thousands of families who lived only by work in them were reduced to misery and starvation. The distress was very severe in 1862 and 1863, but in the latter year supplies of cotton from Egypt and India arrived in quantity sufficient to start the mills again, and the suffering gradually lessened. Private charity did all that was possible to relieve the poor people, and the Government helped.

The loss of Lancashire was the gain of Egypt and India. At Bombay huge fortunes were made, and, although many merchants there were ruined as already observed (*ante*, p. 247) by gambling in cotton the city on the whole was enriched, and the fine public buildings which adorn it date from that period. During the four years 1861–5 Bombay traders received about eighty one million pounds sterling in addition to their ordinary receipts.

Death and Character of Lord Palmerston.—In the autumn of 1865 Lord Palmerston died at the age of eighty-one, having worked hard almost to the last. The few facts in his career for which space could be found in this little book give a very imperfect notion of his restless energy. Although he may be justly blamed for some of his actions, Englishmen forgave his faults because he loved his country, upheld its dignity against all comers, hated injustice and oppression and was eager to resist tyranny. Thus it happened that 'he won and merited the confidence of the nation more than any minister since the younger Pitt'. He was chiefly interested in foreign

politics and cared little about reforms at home. In his day he was classed as a Liberal, but at the present time he would be regarded as a rather extreme Conservative.

Other Wars.—The International Exhibition of 1851 had been supposed by sentimental people to mark the beginning of a period of universal peace. The wars above noticed are enough to prove the error of men who refused to see that human passions and ambitions are too strong to be held back by the desire for peaceful trading. Many more wars were to follow. In 1863 Prussia made an unjust attack on Denmark and seized the Duchies of Schleswig Holstein. In the same year Russia suppressed with ruthless cruelty a revolt in Poland. Lord Palmerston tried to interfere on behalf of the weaker party in each case, but was not prepared to bring England into war for the sake of causes in which she was not directly concerned. His protests consequently did no good.

In 1866 Prussia, under the guidance of the King's able and unscrupulous minister Bismarck, attacked Austria and the southern states of Germany. The Prussian victory was complete and secured the supremacy of Prussia in Germany and central Europe. The kingdom of Hanover and several minor principalities were annexed to Prussia. That war completely changed the 'balance of power' in Europe and laid the foundation for the might of the new German Empire established a few years later which now so often threatens to disturb the peace of the world.

Lord John Russell Prime Minister.—On the death of Lord Palmerston in 1865 Lord John Russell became Prime Minister with Mr Gladstone as leader of the House of Commons, faced by Mr Disraeli as leader of the Conservative Opposition. The question of further Parliamentary Reform in the direction of giving votes to the working classes drawing weekly wages now came to the front. Those classes who had remained generally excluded from political power under the Reform Act of 1832 were beginning to know their strength and to organize themselves in powerful Trades Unions. Lord John

Russell having framed a Bill which the House of Commons rejected, resigned office and retired into private life

Mr Disraeli's Reform Act of 1867.—Lord Derby was then sent for by the Queen to form a Conservative Ministry, which he did with difficulty. Ministers found that they had to meet a vigorous agitation in support of the admission of working men to the franchise or right of voting at elections, and that if they were to stay in office they must propose a Radical measure. Mr Disraeli then Chancellor of the Exchequer and leader of the House of Commons¹ tried to escape by proposing ingenious schemes full of carefully devised precautions and checks. But he had to give up all such devices, and persuade his party to pass a Bill which gave the vote in towns to all ratepayers as well as to lodgers paying £10 rent, and in the country districts to owners of property worth £5 a year as well as to tenants paying £12 rent (1867)². Certain minor changes were made at the same time.

Thus a Conservative Government supposed to exist for the purpose of resisting radical changes became the means of passing a measure of Parliamentary Reform far more Radical than any Liberal Ministry had ventured to propose. The Act gave the vote to the bulk of the working men on weekly wages in the towns and so wrought a change in British politics greater even than that effected by the Act of 1832, which had transferred power from the great landowners to the well-to-do 'middle classes'. The Act of 1867 was rightly described at the time as 'a leap in the dark' because nobody could tell how the newly gained power would be used by the classes to whom it had been granted. People are now beginning to

realize the effects of that 'leap in the dark' The labourers in the country districts got the vote in 1884

The Dominion of Canada.—In the same year (1867) an Act was passed uniting the North American colonies (except Newfoundland, which preferred to remain as before) into a Confederation, extended later so as to form the great 'Dominion of Canada' stretching for 3500 miles across the American continent from the Atlantic to the Pacific The measure was based on the Report written long before by Lord Durham (*ante*, p 330)

Fenian Conspiracies.—In 1866 and 1867 a good deal of trouble was caused by the Fenian conspiracy worked by Irish Americans with the purpose of winning the independence of Ireland A foolish little raid was made from the United States territory on Canada But the American Government did its duty, and nothing of importance happened The feeble attempts at a rising in Ireland were suppressed by the police About the same time certain violent crimes committed in England by the conspirators are believed to have influenced Mr Gladstone in framing a novel policy in regard to Ireland

Abyssinian War.—A well managed little war was waged in 1868 with Abyssinia, the strange Christian country on the African side of the Red Sea Theodore, the king, detained a number of English and other European prisoners, including Captain Cameron, one of Her Majesty's consuls, and would not let them go Sir Robert Napier was appointed to command an expedition to compel their release He started from Bombay, and carried out his orders with great ability When the fortress of Magdala, the capital of the country, was captured, King Theodore was found dead, having committed suicide The commander was rewarded by the title of Lord Napier of Magdala, and the rescued prisoners were brought safely away

Mr. Gladstone and the Irish Church.—The defeat of the Government in the House of Commons on resolutions proposed by Mr Gladstone for severing the connexion of the Episcopal.

Protestant Church in Ireland with the State was followed by a dissolution of Parliament. The elections having given the Liberals a large majority, Mr Gladstone became Prime Minister, and declared his intention to deal with the Church, the land laws, and university education of Ireland, hoping that he would thus be able to get at the roots of the discontent in the island. In July 1869 he carried his Irish Church Bill, which provided for the complete 'disestablishment', or separation from the State, of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and its partial 'disendowment', by applying nearly nine millions of pounds sterling from its funds to other public uses. From that time no form of religion in Ireland has been the official religion—the Episcopal Church like the other churches or sects, manages its own affairs, and manages them very well. In England the Episcopal Church of England is still 'established' as the official religion of the State, and the sovereign, under the Act of Settlement, *must* be a member of that Church. In Scotland the Presbyterian Church is likewise 'established' under official regulation, but the sovereign is not a member of it, for he cannot belong to two churches at once. It is a curious position.

Irish Land Act.—Mr Gladstone's Irish Land Act was passed in the following year, 1870. It rightly required the landlord (*zemindar*) to give the tenant (*ryot*) compensation for improvements effected by the tenant before eviction could take place, and made many other changes which cannot be explained in small compass. The Act has been frequently amended by later statutes, and vast sums have been lent by the United Kingdom to help Irish tenants to buy out the interest of the landlords. But the difficulties of the Irish land question, having their roots in the transactions of many centuries, are not yet disposed of.

Mr. Gladstone's Temperament.—The next four years were full of important events both at home and abroad. Mr Gladstone loved work, and, although then sixty years of age, could bear greater exertion than other men could who

had not half his years. He regarded himself as called by Providence to reform everything at once, and overtaxed the patience of Parliament and the nation by trying to do too much. Unless when his emotions were stirred he cared nothing for foreign affairs, and there can be no dispute that he was less careful of the honour of his country than Palmerston had been. He seemed unable to give serious attention to the position of England as an imperial power. His deepest personal interest was in religious matters, and he had developed a passion of devotion to the Church of England. During his term of office the greatest disturbance of European peace since the Napoleonic wars took place, but it touched him slightly, and he went on with his list of domestic reforms, busying himself in his leisure with questions of theology. He possessed a marvellous gift of oratory and could control either the House of Commons or a huge public meeting with equal success.

Franco German War.—The gigantic war between France and Germany headed by Prussia began in June 1870 and ended early in 1871. The emperor, Napoleon III, surrendered with 82,000 men at Sedan, near the Belgian frontier, in September 1870, the siege of Paris began in the same month and ended in January 1871. The general results were that the French were decisively beaten, the Napoleonic dynasty came to an end, a huge fine was levied from France, the provinces of Alsace and Lorraine were annexed to Germany, and the new German Empire, with the King of Prussia as emperor, was set up. The total collapse of the French power was regretted in England, but the English nation did not feel bound to join in the war. The French established a Republican Government, which after many changes, still exists. By heroic sacrifices they quickly paid off the fine, and reorganized their army and navy. In the forty years following the war, France recovered her eminence in commerce and the liberal arts. When the European crisis came in 1914, she was ready to take up the challenge which Germany again threw down for her.

Education Act of 1870—While the war was going on

Mr Gladstone was busy with his domestic reforms. In 1870, besides the Irish Land Act, his Government carried an Education Act making elementary education in England and Wales compulsory for the first time. Since that date disputes about education chiefly with reference to religious teaching have largely engaged the attention of Parliament and the nation, and are not yet settled (1911).

Abolition of Religious Tests at Universities—In 1871 an Act was passed abolishing all religious tests in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. An Indian student may find it hard to believe that until then persons not being members of the Established Church of England were excluded on account of their religion in large measure from the honours and endowments of the two ancient universities. But so it was. The causes of the exclusion went back to early times, the colleges having been originally religious foundations resembling monasteries in many respects. In Ireland Trinity College, Dublin had admitted Roman Catholics to degrees since 1793. The final abolition of all religious tests there was effected in 1873.

Army Reforms—The organization of the army was improved and the mischievous practice of allowing and generally requiring officers to buy steps of promotion was abolished. But Mr Gladstone gave just offence because he effected the latter reform by means of a Royal Warrant and not by Act of Parliament (1871).

Ballot Act—In the following year (1872) the Act for secret voting by ballot at parliamentary elections was passed (*ante*, p. 329). Nobody now desires a return to the old system of disorderly open voting.

Indian Affairs—In India the Government of Lord (Sir John) Lawrence from 1864 to 1869 had been a time of quiet recovery from the troubles of the Mutiny. Lord Lawrence was strongly opposed to adventurous action beyond the frontier. His able and popular successor Lord Mayo was cruelly murdered by a convict at the Andaman Islands in 1872.

Defeat of Mr. Gladstone's Ministry.—The tremendous energy of Mr Gladstone in passing new laws and making reforms of all sorts began to weary people, while at the same time various incidents combined to make his Government unpopular. He had carried two of his intended Irish reforms by passing the Church and Land Acts. He now proposed to effect the third reform that he had planned by a Bill dealing with Irish University education. It was a bad Bill and deservedly rejected (1873). After some months' delay, Mr Gladstone suddenly dissolved Parliament at the beginning of 1874. The elections went against the Liberals, and the Conservative party, under the leadership of Mr Disraeli, came into power, which it was destined to retain for two-thirds of the period extending to 1906.

Purchase of Shares in Suez Canal.—Minor measures of domestic reform carried out in the early years of Mr Disraeli's Government, and discussions in Parliament on Church matters, need not detain us. The bold purchase of the Khedive's shares in the Suez Canal, effected at the close of 1875 at the cost of four millions sterling, astonished the world. The proceeding gave the United Kingdom a direct interest in Egyptian affairs, and in consequence a certain right of interference. As a business speculation the investment has paid well but that was not the result in which the Prime Minister was much interested.

Title of Empress of India.—The assumption by the queen of the title of Empress of India as from January 1, 1877, was not liked in England, where people had not imagination enough to realize the effect in India. But Mr. Disraeli understood what he was doing and there is no doubt that the new title was pleasing to Indian sentiment. The translation of the title 'Empress of India' caused much discussion. The phrase *Kaiser-i-Hind*, the 'Caesar of India', which was adopted, seems to have given satisfaction. The Prince of Wales, afterwards King Edward VII, had made a successful tour in India during the cold season of 1875.

War between Russia and Turkey.—At this time foreign affairs became much mixed up with the domestic politics of the United Kingdom. The troops of the Sultan of Turkey, when repressing a rebellion in Bulgaria, had committed horrid cruelties. Mr Disraeli (now become Earl of Beaconsfield), who thought it wise to maintain the power of Turkey as against Russia, paid little heed to the Bulgarian horrors, even when proved to be true, whereas Mr Gladstone gave way to his feelings of indignant pity, and did not care what happened to Turkey so long as the Turks suffered for their cruelty, and their victims were rescued. He started a violent agitation on the subject, and attacked the Government with bitterness.

In April 1877 Russia declared war against Turkey, and a strong party in England desired to help the Sultan, as had been done in the Crimean War. Lord Beaconsfield, who was determined to keep Russia out of Constantinople, very nearly went to war, and actually summoned Indian sepoy to Malta. The Indian soldiers had never gone further west than Egypt before (*ante*, p. 296), and their appearance in Europe excited strong objections. After very hard fighting Russia had beaten Turkey and was at the gates of Constantinople, when England interfered, and arranged a Congress at Berlin which modified the terms imposed by Russia (1878). Bulgaria, now a kingdom, then became a separate State, and many other changes were made in the political position of the countries in the Balkans to the north of Greece. Lord Beaconsfield represented England at the Congress and claimed to have brought back 'peace with honour'.

Second Afghan War.—At that moment the Prime Minister had successfully resisted Mr Gladstone's attacks and had acquired great popularity at home and influence abroad. But his power did not last much longer. Undoubtedly he made a grave mistake in sanctioning the Second Afghan War. Lord Lytton, the Governor General of India, resented the intrigues of Sher Ali, Amir of Afghanistan, with Russian officials in Turkistan, and insisted on the Amir receiving a

British Resident When the Amir refused to comply, war was declared, Sher Ali was deposed, Yakub Khan was set up in his place, and Sir Louis Cavagnari was sent to Kabul as Resident. The events of 1842 were repeated. Cavagnari was murdered, and all Afghanistan rose in arms. General Burrows, in command at Kandahar, suffered a severe defeat from Ayub Khan at Maiwand, which was avenged by Sir Frederick (Lord) Roberts, who made a wonderful forced march in twenty three days from Kabul to Kandahar, completely isolated from any base or support (1880). The operations after the murder of Sir Louis Cavagnari are often called the Third Afghan War, but in reality the whole of the transactions may be regarded correctly as forming one series.

Zulu War.—The contest with the fierce Zulu nation in South Africa, under their warlike chief Cetewayo, also was marked by a serious disaster and was even more unpopular than the Afghan War. Sir Bartle Frere, an eminent member of the Indian Civil Service who had been Governor of Bombay at the time of the 'cotton famine' (*ante* p 346) was appointed High Commissioner of South Africa with instructions to effect a confederation of the various colonies in that region. The time not being then ripe for such a measure, the attempt failed. The Union of South Africa was not accomplished until 1910, when conditions had been completely changed by the South African or Boer War. Sir Bartle Frere came to the conclusion that the highly organized military power of Cetewayo, the Zulu chief, was dangerous and must be suppressed. Whether Sir Bartle was right or wrong is a matter on which opinions differ widely. He had no doubts on the subject, and invaded the Zulu country. In January 1879 the camp of the column under Lord Chelmsford, who had with him 1,600 European and 2,500 native troops, was surprised by 10,000 Zulus and mostly destroyed. In course of time the disaster was retrieved and the Zulu country conquered, but the misfortune made the Government unpopular. Much grief was felt at the death of the young French Prince Imperial,

son of the ex-emperor Napoleon III, who had joined the British as a volunteer and was killed in a skirmish.

Mr. Gladstone again Prime Minister.—A period of bad trade in England and of scarcity in Ireland combined with the unfortunate wars to shake the position of Lord Beaconsfield's Government. In March 1880, when a general election took place, the Conservative party was routed, and Mr. Gladstone

resumed office, supported by an unusually large majority in the House of Commons.

Lord Ripon in India.—Lord Ripon was appointed Governor General of India, with instructions to retire from Kandahar and leave Afghanistan alone. Abdurrahman was recognized as Amir. Lord Ripon adopted a sympathetic attitude towards the Indians, and is remembered gratefully by his admirers in India for repealing Lord Lytton's Press Act restoring Mysore to its native dynasty, and other



WILLIAM EWART GLADSTONE

measures, some of which excited violent opposition. It will be a long time before every one will agree about the merits of Lord Ripon's policy. He remained in office for four years (1880-4).

Majuba Hill and the Boers.—In 1883 war broke out between the British South African colonies and the Boers of the Transvaal, mostly people of Dutch descent, who wished to keep their independence. The British troops were defeated at Majuba Hill and their gallant commander, Sir George Colley, was killed. Mr. Gladstone, acting in a spirit widely different from that of Lord Palmerston, tamely submitted to the defeat and gave the Boers what they wanted by a Convention.

signed early in 1884. The transaction probably had much to do with bringing on the South African War of 1899.

Troubles in Ireland ; first Home Rule Bill.—The administration of Mr. Gladstone from 1880 to 1886 is, however, chiefly memorable for his treatment of Ireland and Egypt, with *unsatisfactory results in both cases*¹. The events are too recent and too closely connected with the controversies of current politics to make it desirable to treat them at length. The old agitation of Daniel O'Connell for the Repeal of the Union (*ante*, p. 335) was revived in another form by a party under the leadership of Charles Stewart Parnell. Numbers of outrages and serious crimes occurred in Ireland, and Mr. Forster, the Chief Secretary, tried to meet the evil by stern 'Coercion Acts'. In May 1882 his successor, Lord Frederick Cavendish, and the Under Secretary, Mr. Burke, were stabbed to death in front of the Lord Lieutenant's residence by members of a secret society. In 1885 the Government, having been defeated on a Budget question, went out of office for a few months, while Lord Salisbury formed a temporary Government. But in the beginning of 1886 Mr. Gladstone regained office. He proceeded at once to bring in a Bill for the better government of Ireland, commonly described as the first Home Rule Bill. He lost the support of Mr. Chamberlain, Lord Hartington, and other prominent Liberals, who could not accept the Bill with a clear conscience. Consequently another general election took place, which gave the Conservatives a large majority. The Home Rule Bill was abandoned. A similar fate met the Bill of 1893. In 1920, however, the Coalition Government of Mr. Lloyd George passed an Act which gave Ireland two Parliaments, one for Ulster and another for the rest of the country.

Egypt.—Owing to the heavy debts incurred by the late Pasha Ismail, Egypt, although nominally ruled by the Khedive, was really governed chiefly by the 'Dual Control', the agents of France and England. The Khedive's War

¹ The temporary Government of Lord Salisbury, from June 1885 to January 1886, may be left out of consideration.

Minister, Arabi Pasha, resented this state of things, and started a movement of 'Egypt for the Egyptians', directed against Europeans. He fortified Alexandria and the position became threatening. In June 1882 a disturbance occurred in that city with much bloodshed. France, for reasons of her own, withdrew from the business and left England to restore order. The British fleet then bombarded and took Alexandria. Sir Garnet (Lord) Wolseley defeated Arabi at the battle of Tel-el Kebir, and Arabi was exiled to Ceylon. The result was that a British army of occupation remained in Egypt. Mr Gladstone intended to withdraw the army, but never could venture to do so. The existence of the Suez Canal which is used principally by British vessels makes it impossible for England to leave Egypt to itself. Ever since then Egypt has been practically a Protected State governed by the British, but the relations between the British Government and His Highness the Khedive are so ill defined that constant trouble arises and a more definite legal arrangement is badly wanted. Many valuable reforms have been effected and great public works have been carried out under British supervision.

The Sudan.—The affair of Arabi Pasha in Egypt Proper was settled in a way more or less satisfactory to Mr Gladstone's Government although it involved the resignation of Mr Bright Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster who disapproved of the forcible suppression of Arabi Pasha¹. The events in the Sudan the huge interior province to the south of Egypt Proper were disastrous. The Khedive had long been trying to hold the Sudan against the Mahdi, a fanatical leader who had mastered the tribes and overthrown the Egyptian authority in the province. General Charles Gordon an officer of noble character and high distinction had bravely

¹ The king is also Duke of Lancaster and the revenues of the Duchy are Crown property. The Chancellor is supposed to look after them but the work is really done by subordinates so that he is free to give general assistance to the Cabinet of which he is a member. That was Mr Bright's position—maid of all work, as he called it.

undertaken to hold Khartoum, the capital of the Sudan. But he was overwhelmed, and an expedition sent for his relief, under the thoroughly capable command of Lord Wolseley, arrived just too late to save him. The blame for the delay rests with Mr Gladstone, who was deservedly censured for his hesitation and remissness (January 1885). The Prime Minister's neglect of duty in this matter was one of the chief causes of his fall in the following year.

Lord Salisbury's Ministry ; the Parnell Commission.—Lord Beaconsfield having died in 1881, the Conservative Government which came into office in 1886 was headed by Lord Salisbury, a descendant of Lord Burleigh, Elizabeth's minister. The Government lost credit by the failure to prove its case against Mr Parnell, who was tried by a Special Commission on the charge of having expressed his approval of the murder of Lord Frederick Cavendish and Mr Burke (*ante*, p. 357). The Commission found the principal document produced by the prosecution to be a forgery. Irish affairs continued to cause much anxiety.

The Queen's Jubilee—In 1887, Queen Victoria having reigned for fifty years, the fact was celebrated throughout the empire with much rejoicing. Ten years later the celebration was repeated on a larger scale. The earlier one is known as the Queen's Jubilee, the later as her 'Diamond Jubilee'.¹

Lord Dufferin ; Third Burmese War.—Lord Dufferin, who succeeded Lord Ripon and ruled India from 1884 to 1888, was chiefly interested in foreign and frontier politics. He carried out successfully the Third Burmese War, provoked, like the earlier ones, by Burmese outrages on British subjects, and annexed what was left of the Burmese kingdom with

¹ For the Hebrew 'jubilee year', every fiftieth year, in which slaves were supposed to be liberated and ancestral property restored, see *Leviticus* *chap. xxv*. The term was taken over by the Roman Catholic Church in another sense, and is now extended to celebrations marking periods of twenty five or fifty years. The term 'Diamond Jubilee', referring to a period of sixty years, is fanciful.

effect from January 1, 1886 That annexation has made British India, to which Burma is attached, the neighbour of the Chinese Empire, the kingdom of Siam, and French Indo China—a fact which may at any time bring much work upon the Foreign Offices of both India and Great Britain

London County Council.—Lord Salisbury's Government in 1888 carried a measure for establishing the London County Council, an elective body charged with the general control of the local affairs of Greater London—that is to say, the mass of towns which have grown up round London proper and Westminster The Council deals with an expenditure of ten or eleven million pounds sterling a year, or more than fifteen crores of rupees But the Prime Minister was personally more interested in foreign policy than domestic affairs, and was reputed a skilled diplomatist His influence as such in Europe was great

Second Home Rule Bill; Mr. Gladstone.—Like other governments Lord Salisbury's gradually lost popular favour, and after a general election, Mr Gladstone returned to power in 1892, at the age of eighty three He retired from politics in 1894 and died in 1898 During his last term of office he brought in a second Home Rule Bill for Ireland which passed the *House of Commons* but was thrown out by the *House of Lords*, which on that occasion, at all events, correctly judged the feeling of the nation (1893) Nobody knows how the next Home Rule Bill will be received Mr Gladstone to use the words of Mr Balfour, his opponent in politics, was endowed with 'rare and splendid gifts' As a parliamentary orator he had no superior, and even in extreme old age he was capable of doing an astonishing amount of hard work He was a master of finance, and a scholar of varied learning Since his death no politician of equal eminence has appeared in the United Kingdom

Lord Rosebery Prime Minister.—When Mr Gladstone retired in 1894 his place as Prime Minister was taken by Lord Rosebery, who was never able to do much owing to opposition within his

party He was glad to be defeated on a small matter in the summer of 1895 and to quit office divorced from power

Lord Salisbury again Prime Minister.—When the general election took place the Conservatives or Unionists obtained a large majority and Lord Salisbury again became Prime Minister. His Ministry was strengthened by the adhesion of Mr Chamberlain and the other Liberals who had refused to follow Mr Gladstone in his Home Rule policy, and became known as 'Liberal Unionists' because they supported the union of the British and Irish Parliaments Lord Salisbury remained in office until 1902, when he resigned owing to ill health and was succeeded as Prime Minister by his nephew, Mr Arthur Balfour In the following year Lord Salisbury died

During the course of his administration Japan had defeated China, and the United States had destroyed the Spanish fleet, annexing the Philippine Islands and occupying Cuba for a time As already mentioned, the queen celebrated her 'Diamond Jubilee' in 1897 with impressive pomp Lord Curzon's energetic and much criticized government of India lasted from 1895 to 1905 with a brief interruption

South African War —The long standing hostility between the British colonists in South Africa and the Dutch Boers of the Transvaal and Orange River State passed into open war in October 1899 During the first few months of the struggle the British suffered many reverses, but when Lord Roberts was appointed to the supreme command errors were corrected, and in course of time the British arms were everywhere victorious The war was ended in May 1902 by the signing of articles of peace at Vereeniging Since then as previously noted, the various colonies or states of South Africa have combined to form the Union of South Africa constituted as a single state, not as a federation of self governing states like the Dominion of Canada or the Commonwealth of Australia The South Africa Act, passed in 1909 took effect on May 31, 1910

That event, although lying beyond the limit set for this

history, is recorded here in order to complete the summary view of the South African War

Death and Character of Queen Victoria—Queen Victoria, full of years and honour, passed away on January 22, 1901, and her son, King Edward VII, reigned in her stead

It has been well said that Queen Victoria was a ruler of a new type. No other sovereign in the history of the world had ever occupied a similar position. She settled so firmly the lines on which the constitutional monarch of a democracy should rule that her successors have found the path for them to tread clearly marked out, and have no need to do less or more than follow in the queen's footsteps. She effected that great result by sheer force of personal character, not by exceptional intellectual power. She combined a firm belief in the dignity of kingship and distinct consciousness of her exalted position as head of the British Empire with a hearty acknowledgement of the duty of the sovereign to her people and the warmest sympathy with the joys and sorrows of all her subjects. Her Indian Empire aroused her deepest interest, and nothing gave her greater pleasure than to receive the willing homage of the princes of the East. Although she had never been able, like her royal son and grandson to visit India and show her face to the Indian multitude, the name and likeness of the Great Queen were familiar throughout the land, where high and low felt that their distant sovereign, 'throned in the west' was indeed a *Dharm-ataar*, an Incarnation of Righteousness worthy of the loyal devotion of brave men and virtuous women.

The Empire beyond the Seas—The Victorian age (including the few years since the queen's death) witnessed an immenso growth of the empire beyond the seas. The Indian Empire, which vast as it is forms but a fraction of the whole was increased by the addition of the Punjab and Burma, not to mention minor acquisitions. The development of the colonies, the principal of which are now termed His Majesty's Dominions beyond the Seas, was on a gigantic scale. The small Canadian settlements conquered from the French in the eighteenth

century are now combined into a huge Dominion stretching right across the American Continent for 3,500 miles, and daily increasing in wealth, population, and power. The weak colonies of Englishmen and Dutchmen, often at war one with the other or with powerful native tribes, have joined together to form the South African Union, a single state, large enough to be called an empire in itself. Similarly, the insignificant stations on the Australian coast have been replaced by the Commonwealth of Australia, now embracing the whole island continent, and on the eve of becoming a powerful nation, with its own fleet and army. These few facts may serve to illustrate the enormous change which has taken place in the oversea empire since the queen's accession. An account at all detailed of the actual additions to the empire would require a volume.

Science—The advance of science—that is to say, of exact systematic knowledge of nature—has been marvellous during the same period. Telephones, wireless telegraphy, motor cars, electric light, flying machines, and a thousand other inventions, each in itself a wonder, have become so common that the modern man almost refuses to be astonished at anything. Such novelties were all or nearly all, introduced during the queen's long reign. The wonders of scientific discovery and invention in these days never cease.

Literature—The many-sided activity of the human mind during the Victorian age naturally expressed itself in English literature as well as in every other way, and inspired many works in verse and prose which future generations will not willingly let die. Among the poets the names of Tennyson and Robert Browning are pre-eminent, and prose writers are so numerous that it would be useless to give a list of names. Just a passing reference may be made to the most distinctive literary form of the Victorian age, long novels or prose fictions. The great Victorian novelists—Dickens, Thackeray, George Eliot, and many others of lesser fame—take the place of the dramatists of the age of Elizabeth. The writer last named was really a woman, and the fact may be noted as one of the

many indications of the remarkable change in the position of women wrought during the queen's reign. That change like many other changes, is still in progress. We do not attempt to prophesy, and may be content to share the belief of His Majesty the King Emperor that 'under Divine guidance the ultimate outcome will be to the common good.'

LEADING DATES

Battles of Balaklava and Inkerman	1854
Fall of Sebastopol Lord Palmerston Prime Minister	1855
End of Crimean War Peace of Paris, Persian War	1856
Indian Mutiny	1857-9
China War	1857-60
Queen's Indian proclamation short Derby Ministry	1858
Lord Palmerston again Prime Minister volunteers war between France and Austria	1859
Death of the Prince Consort	1861
American Civil War	1861-5
Lord John Russell Prime Minister	1865
War between Prussia and Austria	1866
Mr Disraeli's Reform Act Confederation of Canada, Fenian conspiracies	1867
Abyssinian War Mr Gladstone Prime Minister	1868
Irish Church Act	1869
Irish Land Act Education Act	1870
War between France and Germany	1870-1
Ballot Act	1872
Mr Disraeli Prime Minister	1874
Proclamation of Empress of India	Jan. 1 1877
War between Russia and Turkey	1877
Congress of Berlin	1878
Zulu War	1879
Second Afghan War	1879-80
Mr Gladstone Prime Minister for the second time Lord Ripon Governor General of India	1880
Suppression of Arabi Pasha in Egypt	1882
Convention with Boers	1884
Death of General Gordon Third Burmese War short third Ministry of Mr Gladstone	1885
First Home Rule Bill Lord Salisbury Prime Minister	1886
The Queen's Jubilee	1887

Mr Gladstone Prime Minister for the fourth time	1892
Second Home Rule Bill	1893
Lord Rosebery's short Ministry	1894
Lord Salisbury again Prime Minister	1895
The Queen's 'Diamond Jubilee'	1897
South African War	1899-1902
Death of Queen Victoria	Jan 22, 1901

CHAPTER XXVI

EDWARD VII AND GEORGE V

Edward VII.—The new King Emperor, the eldest son of Queen Victoria, was born on November 9, 1841. He had been most carefully educated by his father the cultured Prince Consort, and by various tutors. He had studied at Edinburgh, Oxford, and Cambridge,

and had travelled much abroad, visiting Canada in 1860 and India in 1875. In France, especially in Paris, he was a familiar figure and he had an unrivalled knowledge of foreign politics and of European men of affairs. Thus after he became king he was able to exercise a valuable influence on foreign policy, and he is to be considered the chief maker of



KING EDWARD VII

the 'entente' with France and Russia, which saved Europe and the British Empire in the War of 1914-18.

The first task in the new reign was to finish the Boer War, a task successfully accomplished by the Government of the Marquis of Salisbury, who on the conclusion of the war (May 1902) retired from the premiership. The next Prime Minister, Mr Arthur Balfour, was an eminent scholar and

statesman, under whom the Conservative party successfully dealt with some of the most pressing problems of the time

The Japanese Treaty.—The first problem concerned the relations of the British Empire with Japan. The Japanese, a highly progressive people, were extending their commercial and political influence from their own islands to the mainland, particularly in the Chinese province of Manchuria. Their object was not so much to introduce their own power, but to exclude that of Russia, which, having conquered most of Central Asia, had recently established a naval base at Port Arthur.

Great Britain was the first State to recognize that Japan was becoming a Great Power. On January 30, 1902, a treaty of alliance had been negotiated by Lord Lansdowne, who was Secretary of State under the Marquis of Salisbury. When in 1904 war broke out between Japan and Russia over the question of Manchuria, the British alliance prevented the conflict from involving other States, for if any other Power had joined with the Russians, Great Britain would, under the treaty of alliance, have interfered on the Japanese side. After the Japanese had won land battles at Mukden, a great naval battle at Tsushima, and had captured Port Arthur, the Russians recovered some of their losses and the war came to a deadlock. Finally peace was concluded through the mediation of the President of the United States, Theodore Roosevelt, at Portsmouth (State of Maine), on August 29, 1905. Russia evacuated Manchuria and ceded Port Arthur to Japan. The Anglo-Japanese alliance was renewed from time to time, and stood the test of the War of 1914, when Japan helped with ships against the German navy and took the chief part in the capture of the German fortress of Tsing Tau in China.

The Entente—The Anglo-Japanese alliance helped to bring peace in the East. In the same way, the Anglo-French entente of 1904 was meant to help towards the maintenance of peace in Europe. Ever since Germany had made war on France in 1870, and had annexed the French provinces of

Alsace and Lorraine, Europe had been threatened with another war. The peace that existed was an 'armed peace', with every nation armed to the teeth. In 1879 Austria and Germany had made a dual alliance, and in 1882, when Italy joined it, this became the famous Triple Alliance. It appeared that France would some day be attacked and overcome, and to provide against this, France and Russia made an alliance in 1896. King Edward VII and the Prime Minister, Mr Balfour, believed that peace would be kept, if the Germans were convinced that France and Russia would not be left without friends. To make this clear the Anglo French 'entente' was concluded in April 1904. France and Great Britain settled their old disputes concerning the Newfoundland fisheries, and the rights of Great Britain in Egypt, and they agreed to be friends although no military alliance was entered into. A similar 'entente' was made between Great Britain and Russia in August 1907. Thus the Triple Entente of Great Britain, France, and Russia was made. It was largely the work of King Edward VII, who in his travels met both the Tsar of Russia and President Loubet of France. The Triple Entente helped to keep peace in Europe till August 1914, when Germany chose to risk everything in a great onslaught upon it.

Imperial History.—At the General Election held in 1906 the Conservative Government of Mr Balfour was defeated, and the Liberal party came into office, with Sir Henry Campbell Bannerman as Prime Minister. The new Government introduced a large number of important measures into Parliament. One of these acts granted colonial self government to the Transvaal and Orange River Colony, which had been annexed to the British Empire at the end of the Boer War. Another measure, introduced by Lord Morley, Secretary of State for India enlarged the Indian Legislative Councils (the Councils of the Governor General, and of Bombay, Madras, Bengal, the United Provinces, the Punjab, and Burma) and extended their functions (Indian Councils Act,

1909) About the same time, the trade in opium between India and China was abolished In 1909 the British Parliament passed the Union of South Africa Act, making the whole of that country (including the Transvaal and Orange River) into a Self governing Dominion

Domestic Legislation—In domestic British legislation much was accomplished Pensions of five shillings a week were given to people who were over seventy years of age The system of national insurance of work men was established, the cost being shared between the workmen the employers, and the State

By the Parliament Act of 1911, an important change was made in the relations existing between the House of Commons and the House of Lords The Lords had rejected the Budget for the year 1909 on account of the high taxation which it placed upon land The Commons claimed that as the bulk of taxation was raised from their own constituencies they, and not the Lords should have the final word on all money matters Accordingly a bill was introduced into Parliament providing that the House of Lords should not have power to reject any Money Bill and with regard to any other bill the Lords should only have a power of 'suspensive veto'—they were allowed to reject the same bill three times after which 'that Bill shall on its rejection for the third time by the House of Lords be presented to His Majesty and become an Act of Parliament on the Royal Assent being signified thereto' By the same Parliament Act the duration of Parliament was reduced from seven to five years, at the end of this period a General Election must be held

The Houses of Parliament—Notwithstanding the curtailment of its powers occasioned by the Parliament Act, the House of Lords which had not been popular in the country, now began to rise in public estimation and to increase its influence This was largely due to the fact that instead of 'sulkings', and retarding business the House of Lords loyally accepted the situation created by the Parliament Act and

made the best of it. This attitude appealed to our 'sporting' instincts, for the British people admire those who fight to the last and who, if defeated, are not embittered by their loss. The debates in the House of Lords are always sensible, business like, grave, and well informed, and during the Great War the House fully maintained its reputation as a wise, patriotic, and steady influence in the State. On the other hand, the House of Commons to some extent lost power during the Great War, but it regained its control in the subsequent struggle against the high expenditure of the Government in the year 1920. In 1918 the franchise in the constituencies had been greatly extended, and women could vote and also could sit in the House of Commons.

George V.—During the long political crisis which took place over the question of the Parliament Bill, the leaders of the nation had been changed. The Liberal Prime Minister, Sir H. Campbell Bannerman, died in 1908, his place was taken by Mr. Asquith, who remained as Prime Minister till 1916. King Edward VII died in May 1910, and was succeeded on the throne by his only surviving son, King George V. The new king is a man of simple habits, and of a quiet, dignified bearing, he has a firm grasp of the principles of the British Constitution, and his active, unostentatious life is devoted to the public service.

The German Naval Question.—The reign of George V was marked by growing tension in the relations between Great Britain and Germany. The rapid growth of the German Navy was an object of apprehension to thinking people in the British Empire. Germany already appeared to be sufficiently protected by her army, which was acknowledged to be the most powerful in the world, the rapidly growing German Navy seemed to be unnecessary for defence, and only likely to be useful against a purely naval Power, that is, against the British Empire. As the German Navy grew, the British Government was bound in the interests of the Empire, to build faster. Many proposals were made to Germany to

limit her navy, Great Britain offering to limit hers in the same proportion, but no agreement was reached.

The Crisis of 1911.—In the year 1911 a European war nearly broke out. The Empire of Morocco was within the French sphere of political influence, and Germany had acknowledged this in a convention with France dated February 8, 1909. But in 1911 the German Emperor Wilhelm II, apparently regretting this convention, dispatched a warship to Agadir, a port on the Atlantic coast of Morocco. This demonstration of power was meant as a challenge to France, but war was averted by a telling speech which Mr Lloyd George, the British Chancellor of the Exchequer, delivered in the Guildhall of the City of London on July 21, 1911, in defence of France. This speech was taken, rightly, by the German Government to mean that Great Britain would support France if she were suddenly attacked.

Outbreak of the Great War.—So the German Government carried its designs no further at the moment. It waited till it should be still stronger. In 1913 it made an extraordinary levy on the capital wealth of Germany, in order to increase the army. France replied to this by a new Military Service Act. A little later Austria obtained a great sum of money by raising a public loan in London. Everything seems to have been ready for a great war when the terrible murder of the Austrian Archduke Franz Ferdinand and his wife at Sarajevo in Bosnia on June 28, 1914, precipitated the crisis.

Austria accused the Serbian Government of having favoured the agitation which led to the murders, and on July 28, 1914, she declared war on Serbia. To protect Serbia Russia mobilized her army, and thereupon Germany presented an ultimatum to the Tsar and at the same time declared war upon France, the ally of Russia, on August 3.

The Violation of Belgium.—On the same day Germany had treacherously taken steps to surprise France by invading the neutral State of Belgium so as to get a short way into north eastern France and to avoid the powerful French

eastern fortresses Prussia, the head of the German Empire, was herself one of those States (Great Britain, France, Austria, Prussia, and Russia) who solemnly undertook to protect the neutrality of Belgium by the well known treaty of April 19, 1839. The British Government, on hearing of the German invasion of Belgium, at once declared war on Germany, as from 11 p.m. on August 4.

The Combatants.—The Great War was fought at a time when the nations of the world had more material resources and a greater scientific knowledge than at any other period of history. Consequently the military operations were on an unprecedented scale, and the engines of destruction exceeded all previous imagination. The amount of hard work and energy put into the prosecution of the war was amazing, just as the discomforts, the pains and perils, as well as the heroic endurance of them, passed all previous experience. One by one nearly all the nations of the world joined in the titanic struggle. Turkey came in on the side of Germany and Austria in the autumn of 1914, Italy¹ on the side of the 'Entente Powers' (Great Britain, France, and Russia, with Portugal) in 1915, the United States, on the Entente side early in 1917. Besides these, all the Balkan Powers became involved as belligerents, in the East, Japan was from the first on the British side, while later in the war China and Siam also declared against Germany. From South America Brazil sent naval support.

The British Dominions.—As soon as the war started Germany suffered a great disappointment when every member of the British Empire—India, South Africa, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Newfoundland, and all the other British colonies—enthusiastically supported the mother country. In addition to the immense moral effect of the Empire's solidarity, the

¹ Italy was bound by the Triple Alliance only to fight for Austria and Germany in a *defensive* war. As the Germans were the aggressors in 1914, she refused to join with them. When the treaty of Alliance expired by effluxion of time in May 1915, Italy threw in her lot with the Entente.

military effect of the operations of the field armies of India, Australia, and Canada, were incalculable.

Mons.—The completeness of Germany's arrangements for war, and the ruthlessness with which she pursued her objects, convinced almost the whole world that she aimed at universal domination. For a short time Belgium and France had to meet the shock of the terrific onslaught alone, but the small, though perfectly trained, British expeditionary army of 80 000 men (commanded by General French) was rapidly transported across the Channel. The moral effect of this support to the French nation was tremendous. General French took his force into Flanders to meet the right wing of the advancing Germans, who had only been temporarily delayed by the heroic Belgian defence of Liège. The British army encountered the Germans in the neighbourhood of Mons (August 23) but was unable to maintain its positions owing to the defeat of the French armies, further south, around Charleroi. With wonderful skill and resolution, the British army made a retreat—one of the great feats of history—fighting the pursuing masses of Germans all the way back to the river Marne.

The Marne—The French armies under Marshal Joffre, on whose calm judgement the fate of the world then depended, likewise withdrew towards Paris from which, at the most desperate moment, General Gallieni was able to send out a strong relieving force. Turning at the river Marne and suddenly assuming the offensive, the French and British armies inflicted a signal defeat upon the enemy, and rolled them back along the road they had come (September 6).

Verdun and the Somme—The Battle of the Marne saved Western Europe from being then and there overcome by the Germans. It did not end the war, however, for the retreating German armies came to a stop at the lines which they had already begun preparing along the river Aisne. The war came almost to a deadlock. Each side dug into the ground, and gradually established lines of entrenchments and field

fortifications from the British Channel to the borders of Switzerland. A division of the Indian army, under General Willcocks, came to the Western Front in the winter of 1914 For the next three years the German armies on the one side, the French and British on the other, assaulted these lines, with enormous losses in the attempt to find places at which to break them. The mightiest attempts were those made by the Germans to capture Verdun from February to June 1916 and by the British and French armies in the heroic Battles of the Somme from June to November of the same year. The Western Front remained stationary.



H.R.H. THE PRINCE OF WALES

Gallipoli — In the East great efforts were made to pierce the armour of Germany and her allies. A magnificent force was sent in August 1915 to Gallipoli and in a campaign of long drawn out heroism and tragedy tried to fight its way to Constantinople. The

Gallipoli army had to be withdrawn at the end of the year.

The Russian Revolution — Meanwhile the Russian armies, having advanced into Hungary were defeated on the Danube by Austro-German armies and forced back with appalling losses till winter ended the campaigning season. From the terrific losses of the summer of 1915 the Tsar's Government never recovered, in 1917 it was overturned and Russia, under the bloodstained and dishonourable sway of the Bolshevik party, made terms with the Germans and had no more to do with the War.

Mesopotamia — It was in the Mesopotamian provinces of

Turkey that the front of the enemy Powers was at last broken. An Indian Army, after taking Basra, fought its way in 1915 almost to Baghdad, and won a finely fought battle at Ctesiphon (November 22, 1915), then owing to lack of supplies it was forced back into Kut-el Amara, there it was invested for five months, starved out, and forced to capitulate.

Baghdad — Nemesis came swiftly upon the Turks, and on March 11 1917, after a brilliant campaign, General Stanley Maude captured Baghdad. The victor himself died of fever, but not before, by his military success and by the force of his character, he had induced the bulk of the Arabs to turn against Turkish rule.

Jerusalem — The rest of the campaigns in Mesopotamia were slow but sure. They were helped by the revolt of the King of the Hejaz in Arabia against Turkey, and finally by the memorable campaign of Field Marshal Allenby, who marching from Egypt through Sinai into Palestine, broke the Turkish forces in several battles and captured Jerusalem and Aleppo. With the capture of Aleppo, the communications between Turkey and Mesopotamia were cut, so the Turkish armies surrendered and Turkey went out of the war (October 30, 1918). The campaigns in Mesopotamia and Palestine were conducted on the British side chiefly with Indian troops, as only a relatively small number of British regiments could be spared from the Western Front in France.

March 21, 1918 — While the Eastern Front was being broken and while the pressure of the British Navy was steadily bringing home to the Germans that they were really besieged, one stupendous final effort was made by the German General Staff to break through on the West.

The great attempt planned by General Ludendorff was begun on March 21, 1918, and for a few weeks it almost seemed as if the Germans had won the war. The front of the Allied forces was broken, and the German armies, pushing home attack after attack, came at one point within ten miles of Paris. The resolution of the British and French Govern-

ments, as well as the heroism of the British and French Armies, deserve the highest praise. On the urgent representations of the British and French Prime Ministers, Mr Lloyd George and M Clemenceau, all the Allies on the Western Front and also on the Salonica Front, were placed under the single command of the French Marshal Foch. Field Marshal Sir Douglas Haig, who had succeeded Lord French at the end of 1915 in command of the British armies in France, gave his hearty support to the new arrangement. Meanwhile the United States of America, which had come into the war on the Allied side in 1917, were, under the vigorous direction of President Wilson, sending across the Atlantic to France large reinforcements of American troops.

The Second Marne.—On July 26 Marshal Foch struck, and with dramatic effect. The Franco-British Armies, with the Americans, turned on the advancing Germans, and in a second series of Marne battles drove them back towards their old positions. Then followed a brilliant summer campaign. Every day saw the capture of large numbers of the enemy. The famous 'Hindenburg line' of German defences was broken by the British, and the American army fought its way through the lines of the Vosges.

End of the War.—Fighting still though beaten, the German armies retired, shaken but unbroken, when a revolution inside Germany and the flight of their Kaiser Wilhelm II into Holland made further resistance impossible. A few weeks earlier the Italian armies had broken the Austrian front in North Italy, and forced Austria out of the war. A revolution then occurred in Vienna and the Austrian Emperor Charles fled to Switzerland. By this time the Bulgarians, their armies broken at last by the Allied forces in Macedonia (which had held the Salonica Front for over two years), had laid down their arms. The last to give in were the Germans. On November 11, 1918, they signed an armistice and at 11 a.m. the gunfire, which had never ceased for four years, ended on the Western Front.

The Navy.—The Great War would not have ended so quickly and completely in 1918, despite the military victories of the Allies, but for the continuous pressure of the British Navy, which by wonderful skill, energy, and resource, frustrated the elaborate plans of the Germans to starve out England. After the battle fought by Admirals Jellicoe and Beatty with the German Grand Fleet off Jutland on May 31, 1916, the Germans withdrew their surface boats from the seas, and concentrated upon under water vessels, with which they sunk at sight all ships proceeding towards England. But this horrible policy of wrecking and massacre had no more effect on the spirit of the British people than had the attacks made from German airships upon crowded English towns. Gradually the Navy got the war under the water in hand, and the Royal Flying Corps steadily won control in the air.

The Conference of Paris.—The Peace Conference met at Paris, and from January to July 1919 laboured incessantly to settle the problems left by the War. Germany was forced to restore Alsace and Lorraine, which she had taken from France in 1870. Poland, which had been destroyed in the eighteenth century, was again made into a national State, and the suppressed peoples of the former Austrian Empire became free and independent. Germany lost all her colonies, and took upon herself to repay the destruction done in Belgium and France. The Treaty of Versailles, June 28, 1919, registered the terms imposed on Germany, and also established a League of Nations, whose duty is to see justice done between State and State and to prevent in the future a recurrence of the unspeakable calamities which Germany imposed upon the world by her mad and brutal attack on Belgium and France in 1914.

Self-government in the Empire.—The year 1920 began a new period, with many critical problems still to be settled. In particular the races of the world, each conscious of its own identity, were asserting claims to manage their own affairs.

Nowhere were these problems more insistent than in the British Empire which was gradually growing into a Commonwealth of Nations. The Dominions—Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Newfoundland—were already self governing within the British Empire. In 1920 India too received a generous measure of self government to enable the Indians to train themselves for full Dominion status, and in the early months of the year 1921 the Duke of Connaught (the last surviving son of Queen Victoria) a prince who had served in the Indian Army visited the country, and inaugurated the new constitutional system. Liberty and strength are the two conditions necessary for a peaceful and happy world and the peoples of the Empire can only be free when they have freedom to govern themselves and the strength of the whole Empire to defend them.

LEADING DATES

End of Boer War	May 1902
Anglo Japanese Alliance	1902
Anglo-French Entente	1904
Russo Japanese War	1904-5
Union of South Africa Act	1909
Parliament Act	1911
Sarajevo Murders	June 28 1914
Violation of Belgium	Aug 3 1914
Britain's Declaration of War upon Germany	Aug 4 1914
First Battle of the Marne	Sept 1914
Gallipoli Campaign	Aug-Dec 1915
Battle of Jutland	May 1916
Battles of the Somme	June-Nov 1916
America joins the Allies	1917
Capture of Baghdad	1917
Russian Revolution	1917
Germans break through on Western Front	March 1918
Second Battle of the Marne	July 1918
Capture of Jerusalem	1918
Armistice	Nov 11 1918
Treaty of Versailles	June 28 1919
Government of India Act	1920
Visit of Duke of Connaught to India	1921

INDEX

- Aberdeen, Lord, 337, 339
 Aboukir Bay, 289
Abraham and Achitophel, 221
 Absolution, 147 note
 Abyssinian war, 349, 361
 Addington, Mr., 296
 Addison, Joseph, 243
 Adhelfred, Lady of the Merians, 42
 Adhelfrith, king of Northumbria, 30
 Adhelfred, the 'Ill-counsell'd', 44 45 47
 Adhelfstan, (1) brother of Alfred, 33 note, (2) king, 43 44
 Afghan wars, I (1839-42), 332, II, III (1879-80), 354, 355
 African war, South, 247 note, 361, 365, 367, 368, 377
 Agadir incident, 370
 Agincourt, battle of, 103, 114
 Agricola, general, 20 23, 25
 Aix la Chapelle (Aachen), peace of, 252, 256, 260
 Akbar and Alfred, 41, 42, and Henry VIII 153, and Elizabeth, 163 note
 'Alabama,' the, 345
 Albert, Prince, 323
 Albion = Britain 43
 Alfred, (1) king, 33-42, 43, (2) son of Adhelfred 47
 Algiers, pirates of 293
 Aliwal, battle of, 334
 Allectus, British emperor, 21, 25
 Alma, battle of, 339, 339
 Alva, Duke of, 152
 Amboyna, massacre of, 175, 203
 Amherst, Lord, 313, 321
 Amiens, peace of 297 310
 Angles, 13, 14, 25 26, 29
 Angles-y, 11
 Anglia, East, 34 42, 46
 Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, 33, 40, 42, 63, 99
 Anglo-Saxons, 13, 14, 26, 27, 29
 Anne, (1) of Cleves 159; (2) queen of England, 236-44
 Anselm, Archbishop 56
 Antonine's wall, of, 21, 25
 Aquitaine, cession of, 95
 Arabella Stuart, 167
 Arabi Pasha, 358, 364
 Arcadius, emperor, 42 note
 Archers, English 94
 Arcot, defence of 253 260
 Argyle, Earl of, 220, 225
 Armada, Spanish, 156-9, 166
 Army, standing, 220, 231
 Arthur, (1) British king, 27, (2) prince of Brittany, 71, (3) son of Henry VII, 124 125, 128, 135
 Ashdown, battle of, 33, 34
 Assaye, battle of, 300, 310
 Asser, historian, 36, 38, 40 note 41
 'Assizes' of Henry II, 63
 Athelney, Isle of 35
 Attalander 186, 226
 Auckland Lord, 332
 Austerlitz, battle of 302
 Augustine, Saint, 23, 29
 Augustus, emperor 17
 Aulus Plautius, 20, 25
 Aurangzeb, 233
 Austerlitz, battle of, 208, 300 310
 Australia, 363
 Austrian Succession, war of 251-3, 260
 Axe, Norwegian, 51
 Bacon, Roger 80, Lord 16, 163 176, 190
 Badon, Mount, battle of, 27
 Baghdad, 370
 Balahava, battle of 339, 364
 Balfour, Mr Arthur 361, 363
 Balliol de (Balliol), John, 87-9 92, Edward, 93
 Ballot, 329, 352
 Bank of England, 230 244, 287, 235
 Banockburn, battle of, 61, 92
 Barebone's Parliament, 199
 Barlow, Mr George, 361
 Barret, battle of 115, 121
 Bartholomew's Day, Saint, 154 166, 209
 Basle, treaty of, 300, 310
 Bastille, the, 285, 310
 Bayeux tapestry, 61
 Beaconsfield Lord, 254, 256, see Disraeli, Mr
 Beaufort, Cardinal, 113; Margaret and others, 117
 Bede, the Venerable, 26 note, 59
 Bedford, John Duke of, 112, 113
 Beket (Becket), Gilbert 53, 63, Archbishop Thomas, 53, 63-5
 Belfast, 228, 6
 Belgium, 370, 377
 Benedictine monks, 59
 Bentinck, Lord William, 321, 323, 325
 Berlin, decree 302, 306; congress of, 354 364
 Bernier, traveller, 211
 Berwick-on Tweed, 58
 Bible, the English, 132, 165
 Birmingham, 319
 Bishops, wars, 195, 186, 190; trial of the seven, 221, 225
 Black death, 94, 98, 104; Prince, 94, 96; Sea, 328, 340
 Blenheim, battle of, 237-9, 244
 Boers 263 356, 361, 377
 Boleyn Anne, 135-7, 140, 141, 148, 150, 170
 Bollingbroke, Henry IV born at, 163 note, Lord 240, 242, 245
 Bombay 210, 211, 221
 Bonaparte, see Napoleon
 Bosworth, battle of 120-2
 Bothwell, James, 152
 Boudicca (Boadicea), 20, 25
 Bouvines, battle of 73, 75
 Bow, long, 51, 82, 84
 Boyne, battle of, 227, 235, 244
 Breda, declaration of, 295, 297, peace of, 212, 213
 Breigny, treaty of 95, 104
 Bretwalda, defined, 30
 Brice's day, 81 44
 Bright, Mr John, 330, 354
 Britain, Great, 11, 168
 British Isles, 11
 Britanni (Britain the Low), 11, 12 62, 75
 Browning Robert, 363
 Bruce (de Bruce), Robert, 67, 89, 92
 Brunanburgh, battle of, 43, 45
 Brythonic tongues, 12, 13
 Buckingham, Duke of (1)
 Beaumont, 118, (2) Villiers, 171, 173, 182; (3) son of (2), 212

- Bankers Hill, battle of, 267, 243
 Banyan, John, 224
 Barch, Hubert de, 75, 82
 Burgundy kingdom of 46,
 Duchess of 124
 Burke Edmund 260, 277 9
 Burleigh (Burghey) Lord
 150 122
 Lurinese wars (I) 313
 2, (II), 314, 339, (III)
 2, 30 36
 Burnell Robert 79 86.
 Bute Lord, 264 283
 Butler Samuel, poet 209
 Buxar battle of 260, 283.
 Byng Admiral 257
 Byron, Lord, 3-4

 'Cabal' the 212
 Cabinet, the 230 24.
 Cade Jack, 114 115.
 Cadiz, 182, 190
 Caesar title 17 3, 3
 Calais, 91, 104, 147, 148
 Calcutta, 233, 244 2, 7 260
 Calvin, John, 133
 Campbell Bannerman Sir
 H., 36
 Camperdown, battle of 28
 Canada conquest of 23
 259 64 rebellion in
 230 Dominion of, 319
 364
 Canning, Mr George 308
 316 Lord 341 313.
 Canton, 341
 Candite 31 note 45-8, 62.
 Cape (Colony) of Good
 Hope 301 309 310
 Carausius 21 25
 Cardinal defined, 136
 Carnatic, war in, 252
 Caroline of Anspach 2, 0
 Carr Robert 171 180 189
 190
 Cashel synd of 66.
 Castlereagh, Lord, 308
 Catharine of Braganza 211
 224 see Katharine
 Catholic emancipation, 312,
 315 32.
 Caxton, William, 121
 Cecil William, 150, 171,
 Robert, 171
 Cecil (churl) defined, 20
 Ceylon, 297 note 309 note
 Chamberlain, Mr Joseph,
 361
 Chancellor of the Ex
 chequer, 348 note
 Channel Islands, 11 1 71
 Charlemagne emperor 31
 Charles, VI of France, 108,
 V, emperor, 130 132, 13.
 146 note I, of England,
 180-03 II 207-17
 Charnock, Job 233
 Charter Great, see Magna
 Carta.
 Charism, 323
 Chatham, Earl of, see Pitt,
 William (I)
 Chancer poet 99 164
 Chester, 23, 27, 43
 Chillianwall battle of 331.
 07 no wars with I (1840-
 2) 231 735, II (1847-60)
 310 304
 Chippenharn, peace of 31
 45.
 Churches 350
 Cinque Ports 77 note
 Cintra, convention of 302,
 310
 Cistercian monks, 59
 Civil war 188, 190-8
 Clarence George, Duke of
 116 117
 Clarendon, constitutions of
 63, 6, assize of, 68
 Earl of 208, 12, 22, 2.
 Claudius, emperor, 19 23
 2.
 Clive Robert 253 258-60
 Cloth of Gold Field of
 130
 Coût see Candite
 Coal, 23 4 note 280, 282.
 Condition ministry 7
 Cobden, Mr Richard, 330
 Coinage, debased 147
 reformed, 162, 231
 Coleridge poet 324
 Columbus 127
 Commons, House of 76 70
 107 176 183 186 187
 193 199 226, 230 24
 250 202, 263 277 204
 31 19 329 339 343 348
 Commonwealth, the 190-0
 Com 224
 Confederates, 344 note
 Connaught, 67 184 201
 Connaught, Duke of visit
 to India 37
 Convention parliament 225
 Coote Sir Eyre 250 27.
 Copenhagen battle of 236
 310
 Corn laws, 330 33, 336
 333
 Cornwall 12 27, 31 42, 73
 Cornwallis Lord 270 279
 284 289 290, 292, 301
 Corporation defined 86
 note
 Cotton family 346
 Courts of Law 59 68 86
 Covenant, 193
 Cranmer Archbishop 147
 150
 Crecy (Creasy) battle of
 93 94 104 108.
 Crimean war 338-40 364
 Cromwell Thomas Earl
 of Essex, 138 139, 148
 160 170 183, 200 Oliver,
 192 204 Richard and
 Henry 20.
 Crusade (I) 16, (II) 68
 note, (III) 63, (VII and
 last) 79
 Culoden, battle of, 2-1
 260, 261

 Dallouie Lord 334 343
 Dant, Earl of 213 215
 Dinelaw (Dunelagh) 3, 42.
 Dines 11 31, 33 6 42-7,
 in Ireland 66
 Darnley Henry, 152
 Darwin, 14
 Declarations of indulgence,
 17 220 22.
 Deior Daniel 234
 Dell 341
 Denmark 13 31 44 46
 206, 347 Prince George
 of 22, 23
 Derby Lord 344 364
 Dermot king of Leinster,
 66
 Derry see Londonderry
 Despensers Hugh 91
 Dettingen battle of 251,
 260
 Dickens 303
 Directory the 286
 Dispend 2 power 213
 Disraeli Sir 336 344 347,
 348 353 see Leconfield
 Lord
 Dist 210 314
 Domesday book 5, 61
 Dominican monks, 82
 Dower treaty of 12 205
 Drake Sir Francis 154 162,
 166
 Drapers Letters the 248
 Drogheda storm of 19,
 206
 Drutis 10
 Dryden John, 224
 Dublin 13 76 162, 197,
 15 22 23 292 352.
 Dillay (I) agent of Henry
 VII, 129 153 (-) John
 Earl of Warwick, 145,
 (J) Guilford 145
 Differin, Lord 350
 Dunbar battles of I
 (1296) 88 92 II (1650)
 198 200 202 207
 Dundee Account 226
 Dunkirk 20.
 Dunstan Arch bishop 43
 44
 Durham county palatine
 53 university, 203 Lord,
 330 349
 Dyrham (Deorham) battle
 of 27

 East India Company 163,
 166, 190, 224 233 342
 Edward (I) king 43, (2)
 Atheling 5.
 Edgehill, battle of 190 208.

- Edinburgh, 30, 32, 151, 167, 198
 Edmund, (1) king, brother of Æthelstan, 43, 44, 56, (2) Ironside, 45, 52, 57.
 Eadred, king 43
 Edward, (1) the Elder, 42, 43, 44, (2) the Martyr, 44, (3) the Confessor, 47-50, (4) I 83-91, (5) II, 91-92, (6) III, 92-7, (7) IV, 115-18, (8) V, 118, (9) VI 143-5, (10) VII, 3-3, 362-9
 Edivy king 43
 Eibert, king 31, 33
 Egypt 236, 308, 364
 Eleanor, (1) of France, queen of Henry II 62, (2) of Provence, queen of Henry III, 76, (3) of Castile, queen of Edward I, 83
 Elliot Sir John, 183; George, 363
 Elizabeth, (1) of York 122, (2) queen of England, 137, 148-66, (3) daughter of James I 175
 Ellendun battle of, 31
 Ellenborough Lord, 278 note, 320, 332, 333, 338.
 Emma queen of Æthelred and Canute 48, 47
 Empress 126, 129
 Empress of India 3-3, 364
 England 11, 12, name of, 14, 27
 Enniskillen 227
 Lord defined 30
 Essex, 26, 42 earls of 139, 161, countess of, 171
 Esthonia, 40
 Etaples peace of 125, 128
 Ethandun, battle of, 34, 35, 45
 Ethelbert king of Kent, 28
 Eugene Prince, 237-9
 Evesham, battle of, 77, 78, 82
 Excommunication, defined, 65 note
 Exhibition, International 337, 347
 Factorless laws regulating, 323
 Fairs Queen 164, 166
 Falkirk, battle of 88, 92
 Falkland, Lord 191
 Famines of 1257, 76, 82, Irish 336, 338
 Farker, Guy 163
 Federal 341 note
 Fenian conspiracies 343, 364
 Fenwick, Sir John 226
 Ferdinand of Aragon 124
 Ferozshah (Pharushahr), battle of, 334
 Feudal system, 54, 55
 Fire of London, 211, 225.
 Fisher, Bishop, 137.
 Flemings 99, 102.
 Floiden, battle of, 123, 148
 Fontenoy, battle of 231, 260.
 Forest, New, 6a, law, 68.
 Fox Bishop 126; Charles, 277, 298, 307, 310
 Francis Sir Philip, 372, 278
 Franciscan monks, 82
 Franco-German war, 351, 364
 Frederick the Great, 251, 258
 'Free Companies,' 95.
 Freve, Sir Bartle, 255
 Fyrd, or shire-levies, 62, 158
 Gaelic language, 12, 66
 Galileo 165.
 Gallipoli campaign in, 373, 377
 Garter Order of, 262 note
 Gaul, 17
 Gaunt (Ghent), John of 98, 100, 107, 117, 122, 156
 Geoffrey (I) Count of Anjou, 61, 62 (2, 3) sons of Henry II 64, 65.
 George prince of Denmark, 236, kings of England, I 244-9 II, 244-60, III 281-312 IV, 312-16, V 343, 369-77
 George Mr Lloyd 370
 German menace 369
 Ghazni 332
 Ghent treaty of 307
 Gibbon, Edward, 283
 Gibraltar 270, 274, 284
 Gladstone Mr 337, 349-54, 356, 9, 360, 364, 365
 Glencoe massacre of 226
 Glendower Owen 107
 Goderich, Viscount, 316, 325
 Godfrey, Sir R. B. 214, 215
 Godwin Earl, 46
 Gordon, General 3-8, 364
 Gough Lord 334
 Grand Alliance 238
 Grattan Henry 276, 290
 Great Britain 11, 168.
 Greek war of independence, 313
 Grenville George 264, 265, 283, Lord William 307
 Grey Lady Jane, 145, 148, Lord 320, 321, 325
 Grimbold St 42
 Grossette Lishop, 76
 Guiso legate 75
 Guiana, British, 301
 Gujrat battle of, 334, 339
 Gulliver's Travels 242
 Gunpowder plot, 168, 180, 209
 Guthrum 35
 Habeas Corpus Act, 215, 2-5, 312
 Hadrian, wall of, 21, 25
 Haidar Ali, 272, 284, 289
 Haldon Hill, battle of 63
 Hampden, John, 184, 191
 Hanover, 232, 243, 261, 309, 326, 338
 Hardicnut (Harthacnut) 31 note, 47
 Hardinge, Lord (Sir Henry), 333, 334, 338
 Harfeur, 108
 Harold, king, (1) Harefoot, 47; (2) son of Godwin, 49-52; (3) Hardrada of Norway, 50
 Hastings, battle of, 51, 52, 57, Warren 271-4, 278, 279, 284, 321; Marquess of (Lord) 307, 313
 Hebrides 11
 Henricet, 2-5
 Henrietta, Maria, queen of Charles I, 178, daughter of Charles I 252
 Henry son of Henry II of England 64, IV, king of France, 1-9, 180, kings of England—I 56-61; II 61-8, 75, III, 75-82, IV, 103-7, 114, V, 107-11, 114 VI 111-16, 120, 121, VII, 122-8, VIII, 123-43
 Herat 341
 Hereward the Wake, 53
 High Commission, court of, 151, 186, 206
 Hobbes Thomas, 224
 Holland wars with 199, 206, 211, 213, 224, 225
 Home Rule Bills, 3-7, 360, 364, 365
 Homildon Hill, battle of, 106
 Hongkong, 331
 Honorius emperor, 23, 42 note.
 Hooker, Ecclesiastical Polity of 165
 Horsa, 25
 Hudibras 209
 Huguenots, 182
 Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester 112, 113
 'Hundred defined 30
 'Hundred Years War' 29, 63
 Icel tribe 19
 Impeachments, 186, 193, 248, 249, 278
 Independence, declaration of, 269, 283
 Independents 191, 267
 India and England, 16, Alfred a mission to, 40, Bill of Fox, 277, Act of 1784, 278, 284, Self-

- government Acts, 377.
 177, see East India
 Company
 Internmann, battle of, 23,
 344.
 Innocent III Pope, 72-73.
 Ireland, 11 16, 29; see 11
 conquest of by Henry II
 64-67 under Henry
 VIII 134; see under
 Elizabeth 163-166
 under (1700) 177, 180
 204-205, union with,
 204.
 Iron 124, 129.
 Irish, Lutebels, (1641),
 157-159 194, (184)
 700 church and land,
 310 340, 344.
 Isabella, Queen, (1) of
 Edward II 107, (2) of
 Edward II 107.
 Italy and the French, 297,
 298.
 Jacobite claims 216 219
 241 314.
 Jamal, 2, 202.
 James, I of England (VI of
 Scotland) 16-21 11
 217 220.
 Japan, 361 treaties with
 Britain, 364 37.
 Java, 301 309 310.
 Jeffreys, Chief Justice 220.
 Jena, battle of 307.
 Jersey, 11.
 Jerusalem, Alfred's gifts
 to, 40, capture of, 374
 377.
 Jesuits, 218 note.
 Jews, 70, 86.
 Joan (Jeanne) Dare 112
 113, 124 note.
 John, king, 71-8.
 Johnson, Samuel, 283.
 Jubilees of Queen Victoria,
 349 361, 364 365.
 Judges, independence of,
 23.
 Julius Caesar 17 19 20.
 Jutes, 13 25, 26 29.
 Kâbul, 337 340.
 Katharine (1) of France,
 queen of Henry V, 110
 (2) of Aragon 121 129,
 135-7 140 140 (3)
 Howard 139 (4) Parr
 139 see Katharine
 Keats, poet, 34.
 Keltic languages 12, 66.
 Kent 13 20-31 38.
 Kepler 160.
 Ket, Robert, 143.
 Killiecrankie, battle of, 226.
 Labourers statute of 98
 104 163.
 Large Pay Bill of 24,
 27.
 La Hogue battle of, 213,
 244.
 Lake Lord 207.
 Lancaster duchy of, 354
 note.
 Lanerc, Arch'diop, 55,
 56.
 Langdon, William 99.
 Law Mr Ponsar 210.
 Lawrence, Lord, 222.
 Law, Arch'diop 174, 140
 141, 214.
 Leir, 107 66.
 Leipzig, battle of 300, 309
 310.
 Leslie, Earl, 44.
 Legation 91, 17.
 Lewis battle of 72.
 Liverpool surrenders of 227
 23-44.
 Lincoln, parliament of 90.
 Linen manufacture 180,
 224.
 Literature 30, 161 221,
 213 223 227 23 363.
 Liverpool Lord 304.
 Lowelyn, Prince 81.
 Locke John 74 24, 222.
 Holland, 10 104.
 London, 16 13 20, char-
 ters of, 64-74 County
 Council, 364.
 Londonderry defence of
 227 244.
 Lords Ordainers, 91.
 Louis, prince, 119.
 of France—IX 79 XI
 174 XII 21, 218 220
 224 XVI, 241 242, 243
 XVII and XVIII 340,
 317 Philippe 21.
 Loubourg, 245 200.
 Lovel Lord rebellion of
 123.
 Lucknow 341.
 Luther Martin, 133-5, 140.
 Lyttel Lord 241 356.
 Macanlay Lord 201.
 Macclesfield Lord Chan-
 cellor 47.
 Malraa, 241 2 2 271 272.
 Magna (arta) (Charta) 71
 73 75 76.
 Mahadipur battle of 333
 338.
 Malwand battle of 300.
 Malplaugh battle of 306.
 Malplauet battle of 230
 244.
 Malta, 206 354.
 Man Isle of 11 12.
 Manchester 319 Lord,
 100.
 Mangalore treaty of 272.
 Manx language 17.
 Marathas, 272, 274, 281,
 297, 300 312.
 Marston of 16 117,
 118, 119 of Henry VIII,
 16.
 Maria Theresa, empress,
 241 247.
 Maria II battle of.
 Marston, Duke of
 2 6-44.
 Marne, battle of 372, 373
 3.
 Marston battle of,
 131 200, 200.
 Mary I of England, 117-4,
 20 11 70-7 queen
 of Scots 140 142, 143,
 145 146, 147 167.
 Matilda (Matilda) (1) queen
 of William I 21 200.
 (2) queen of Henry I 27.
 (3) empress 23-61.
 Mauviel 301 302, 310.
 Mayne Lord 332.
 Meath, 60.
 Melburne Lord 371 372
 373 331 332.
 Merchants statute of 86
 9.
 Merets 30 34 34, 46.
 Mesopotamia campaign in,
 34.
 Methodist 24-6.
 Met battle of 213, 214.
 Met 200 20.
 Milton John 204 224.
 Minden, battle of 259 260.
 Minerva, 740 27 274.
 Minto, Lord, 1, 301 307,
 44, 301 note.
 Minto 82 disolu-
 tion of 124 144.
 Monk General (Admiral)
 109 270.
 Monmouth Duke of 216,
 220.
 Monopoly, 140 160 174,
 183.
 Montfort Simon de 70.
 Montrose Marquess of 193.
 Moore Sir John 300.
 More Sir Thomas 137.
 Mortimer Roger 9 93,
 104 Edmund 103 108.
 Mortimer (Cross), battle of
 110 111.
 Mortimer Lord 161.
 Muir (Moodree) battle of,
 334.
 Munster 66, 161.
 Mutiny Act 231 244,
 Indian 341 342, 364.
 Mysore 272 280 300.
 Mysore 230.
 Nantes revocation of Edict
 of 20 22 230.
 Napier of Magdala, Lord
 340.
 Napoleon I Bonaparte,
 296 297 298 299 24 250,
 297-300, 302-6, 309 310,

- 323, II 317 note, III, 326, 33 333
 Naseby, battle of 192, 200, 202.
 National Debt 230 247, 254
 National Health Insurance Act 328
 Navarino, battle of 313 316 333
 Navy of Alfred 36 of Henry V, 110, of Henry VII 127 of Henry VIII 147 of Elizabeth, 151 163 of Charles I 184 of George III 257
 Nelson Lord (Admiral), 257 249 333
 Neg. d. war with, 307, 313.
 Netherlands, 157, 154
 Neville's Cross, battle of 93 94 104
 Newcastle Duke of 256, 257 260, 261
 New England, 174
 Newfoundland 240 349
 Newton Sir Isaac 18, 224 225, 331
 Nile battle of 89 310.
 Nimwegen, peace of 214 215 334
 Norfolk 26.
 Normandy 49, 49, 52, 57, 60 61 71 75, 94 110.
 Norsemen (Northmen), 13, 31
 North, Lord 266, 271 274 277, 283
 Northampton, seizure of 68, treaty of 97, 104.
 Northumbria, 30, 34 42, 44 49 53 282.
 Norway 13 31 46, 47 60, 61 62, 86 87
 Nottingham, 190
 Nova Scotia, 240.
 Oakley, battle of 33
 Oates, Titus, 214
 O'Connell, Daniel 335.
 Offa, king of Mercia 31
 Old Age Pensions Act, 368.
 Oldcastle Sir John, 108, 13
 O'Neill Hugh, 161.
 Opium, 331
 Orange Prince of 214 222.
 Orleans, 31
 Orleans, siege of 117 115.
 Ormuz, capture of 175
 Oudenarde, battle of 239 244
 Outram, Sir James, 341
 Overbury case 171
 Oxford University 68 80, 180 189, Provisions of, 77 87, Lord, 240 245.
 Palatine counties 3 54, 110 117, 175, 184.
 Palat. the 114
 Palestine campaign in, 374 377
 Palmerston, Lord 317 316, 33 333 341 343 345-8
 Pander batt. of 313
 P. nat. batt. of, 24
 Papacy explained 28, 29
 Paradise Lost, 204 224, 225 226
 Paris treaty or peace of (1763) 264 283 (1763 = Versailles) 264 (1815) 311 375, (1870) 339 340.
 Part II defined 209 note
 Parliament, beginnings of 6, 9 Model 89
 DO note of Lincoln 90
 Good 93 under Henry IV 10 under Elizabeth 159 under James I 169, 171 172, 180 Short, of 1640 183 Long 186, 190, 206 the Rump 193
 Bar bone 199 of Cromwell 200 the Cavalier 207 215, 218, 224 Short (1753-5), of Charles II 213, 216, 224 of James II 219 Convention 224
 Irish 275-7 290 297-4 reform of 317 19 348 Act of 1911 379 368, 377
 Parnell, C. B., 333
 Paulinus, 93.
 Paul's, cathedral of St., 224.
 Pavia, battle of 132, 148.
 Peel, Sir Robert, 315 316, 322, 325 330 332, 334, 336.
 Peers, creation of 240, 244
 Pegu 334
 Peking, 341
 Pelham, Henry 256.
 Pembroke William, the Marshal, Earl of, 75 82.
 Penal laws, 227 238
 Peninsular war 300 307 7 310.
 Penn, William, 222.
 Perceval, Mr Spencer 308.
 Persia, war with, 341, 364.
 Petition of Right, 182.
 Phil p. king of Spain 146, 148, 152, 156.
 Phil plough, battle of 193
 Philippa, queen, 99, 102.
 Picta, 21 23
 Pilgrim Fathers, 174 190
 Pilgrimage of Grace, 138
 Pilgrims Progress 224, 225
 Pillory 234 note
 Pindari war 312, 325
 Piskie, battle of 143 149
 1 t. (1) William Earl of Chatham, 257 260-4 266, 277, 278, 280 (2) William
 the Younger 277-9 284 285, 287 272-6, 307, 308 310
 Plague of London 211 223
 Planchet Geoffrey 59
 Kings 6 note
 Plassey battle of 238, 240
 114 P. pl. 214 215 225
 Rye House, 21 23.
 Plowman Vision of 1 ere 59
 Poitiers, battle of 9 104
 Polson 93.
 Poll tax 98 100
 Pont Harry 211 222 264 283, 329
 Pontefract (Pomfret) Castle 103.
 Poor Law, 163, 311 320.
 Pope of Rome 28 Alex under 244
 Porto Novo batt. of 272.
 Portugal 296, 300 302.
 Prodonius, 19 note
 Postage penny 3 7
 Potatoes, 172, 336
 Poynings's Act, 23, 276
 Præsumptio statute of 97
 Pragmatic Sanction 251
 Presbyterian church, 19, 28 242.
 Press, licensing of, 233, 244
 Preston battle of 194, 206.
 Prestonians, battle of 251
 Pretend rs, the 22, 236, 242, 246
 Prices a Purge 193
 Principia, 24 253.
 Printing invention of 171
 Privy Council 50 127 246 note.
 Protectorate the 196 199-205.
 Protestant defined 134
 Provisors, statute of 9
 Prussia, 347
 Pulteney, William 249
 Puritans, 189 208
 Pym John, 191
 Pytheas, 19 note.
 Quebec capture of 239 260.
 Quia Emptores statute 80, 92.
 Quiberon Bay battle of 259 260.
 Radicals, 312.
 Raleigh, Sir Walter 167 172, 180
 Ramillies, battle of 239 244.
 Ranjit Singh 333
 Bathmires, batt. of 197
 R6 (libé) expedition to, 182.
 Rebellion, Irish, of 1798, 291 310.

- Reform of parliament, 317-
19 3-5 314
Reformation, the 132-3, 1
163.
Regulating Act, 271
Renascence 1-13
Repeal of the Union, 329
Lexington, Eng. N. 22,
French, 254-6.
Rich, Archibald Edmond,
18.
Richard I 104-11 3 II,
100-104, 111 117 21
Rights, Declaration and
Bill of 225 231 244
Ripon, Marquess of (Lord),
315, 316, 254, 364.
Robert, Duke of No-
mandy 26, 5
Roberta, Lord, 3-5
Robinson, George 24
Rortale 93, 14
Rockingham, Marquess of,
22 20
Rodney Admiral, 270, 234.
Roe Sir Thomas 1-4
Roman empire and occupa-
tion, 17-25 42 note
Rowbery Lord 369 365
Rome wars of the 114-21
Royal Society 224
Rannymede 73
Rupert, Prince 190, 191
193.
Ruskin, Mr 3-4
Russell Lord, 217 Lord
John, 319 324 347
Russia, 305 334-40 364
373 Russo-Japanese War
366, 377
Rywick, treaty of 235,
244.
Sacheverell, Dr., 240
Saladin (Salah-ud-din) 68.
Salamanca, battle of 304
Salib, treaty of, 274
Salisbury, assembly at, 3-
Lord 359 361 365.
Samson Armistice 2-4
Sarajevo murders 370, 377
Saragoza, surrender at, 269
272.
Saxons, 13 26, 29
Science modern, 2 4 3-4
383
Scotland 11 12, 14, 21 44
wars with 84-9 91 7 130
143 151 James VI of
167 Montrose in 193
Argyle's rebellion in, 2-1
'Protestant' revolution in, 2-2
union with, 241 247
Jacobite risings in, 246,
251
Scott, Sir Walter, 3-4
Sebastopol, 338-40 361
Secession, war of 314 315,
364
Semi see Hastings.
Seventh Act, 246, 260,
3-7
Septim in Severus, wall of,
21 23.
Serampatam, 249
Settlement Act of, 222,
241 3-4.
Seven Years' War 2-4-6-8
Beymore Jade 137 F
ward Duke of Somerset
143 145, Sir William,
16
Shalaberry Ashley, Earl
of 212, 213, 224.
Shaker case, 16 161.
Shelburne Lord, 2-0
Shelley poet 3 4.
Shelburne, 11
Shipmoney 184.
Shire deposed 30
Shirley Alderson, 217
Shin frontier 301, wars,
333 4 334 339
Simms, Lambert 123
Sind (Sindus), 333
Singapore 321
Nine pe battle of 314.
Slavery 307, 310, 3-0, 344
345
Slava, battle of 100
Solomon, battle of 314
Somers, Lord 230 242.
Somme, battle of the 3-3
Sophia, Electress, 23-
South Sea Bubble 247
260.
Spain, Peter the Cruel of
9-5, union of provinces of
194 note power of 129
Philip II of 146 and
Elizabeth, 154-9, and
James I 172 and Crom-
well, 202, 207 Lenin
sular War in, 300 304
Spanish Succession, war of
235-9 244
Spectator the 245
Spencer, Edmund, 164
Stafford, Lord 21-4.
Stamford Bridge battle of
60 52.
Stamp Act, 265
Standard battle of the 60
61
Steam-engines, 3-4
Strafford Earl of 183 18-4,
196
Strathclyde Kingdom, 27
42.
Strongbow Richard 66
Stuart, dynasty 167 2-5
James 2-6 note
Style old and new 2-3
260.
Sudan (Soudan) 3-8
Suez Canal 301 2-3
Suffolk, 6 Dukes of 113
140
Suffren Admiral de 274
Surrender, Act of 151,
166.
Surrey, 3-1
Swell Dean, 143 214
Myrian War 311
Tafavera, battle of 304
Tamesworth 30
Tangier 211 224
Telegraph, 3 4.
Tel-el-Kat 2 battle of 352
Telephones, 361.
Tennessee, 3-1.
Test Act 213 225.
Tewkesbury, battle of 116,
1-1
Thackeray, 361.
Thames 1-4 of 23.
Theobaldus, emperor, 4-
note
Thirty Years War, 17-4,
18 190
Thier and 2-7
Tinselral, battle of 5-7, 61.
Tippo (Tippoo), Sultan 2-7
2-3 297
Tihes 319
Tobacco, 172, 174
Toleration Act, 231 244,
314
Toros 2-6 230, 240 261
Tory origin of term, 216.
Toxic Earl 42 40
Toul use, war of 6-7 75,
battle of, 305 310
Tower of London, 84
Towns, growth of 80
Townshend Lord 245.
Townton, battle of 116, 121
Tralee unions 347
Trafalgar battle of 207,
210
Transvaal, 361
Triennial Act, 217
Triple Entente 367
Troyes treaty of 110 114
Tudor Henry 120, dynas-
ty 122.
Turkey and Russia, 3-4,
364.
Turner J M W., 723
Tyler Wat, 102, 104 114
Uster 66, 178 189, 196
Uniformity Acts of 1-1
166, 108
Union, with Scotland, 241
21 with Ireland, 29-4
310
United Kingdom 11 204,
States, 703 307, 310
Universities 80 3-
Utrecht, treaty of 239-42,
244 249 2-7
Vane Sir Harry 20-4.
Vernon battle of 112, 115.
Versailles, treaties of 270
284 3 6 3-7
Victoria, Queen 326-6-4

- Factory, the, 208, 209
 Vienna, congress of, 309, 310
 Vikings 83
 Villains 102
 Villiers, Robert, 171, 180
 190
 Vimiera, battle of, 300 310
 Vincent, Cape St., battle of, 287
 Virginia, 172.
 Vittoria, battle of, 304, 310
 Volunteers Irish, 270;
 British, 344.
 Vortigern, 25

 Wakefield, battle of, 115, 121
 Wales, 11, 13, 27, 29, 42, conquest of, 83, 92, Prince of, 84
 Wallace, Sir William, 68, 92
 Wallingford, peace of, 61, 63
 Walpole, Sir Robert, 248-50, 260
 Walsingham, Sir Francis, 150
 Wandsworth, battle of, 259, 260
 War, The Great, 1914-18, 370-7
 Warbeck, Perkin, 123, 124, 128
 Warwick, earl of, (1) the king maker, 115, 116;
 (2) son of Duke of Clarence, 62, 123, 124; John Dudley, 145
 Washington, George, 267, 268
 Waterford, 13, 66.
 Waterloo, battle of, 306, 309, 310
 Haverley Novels, 324
 Wedmore, peace of, 34, 45
 Wellesley, Lord 289-91, 296, 297, 300, Sir Arthur, see Wellington Duke of
 Wellington, Duke of 300, 302-7, 310, 315, 316, 318, 323
 Welsh language, 12; see Wales
 Wentworth, Sir Thomas, 183 184.
 Wesley brothers, 25; 323
 Wessex, 26, 30, 31, 33, 35, 38, 41, 43, 53 282
 Westminster Abbey, 48, 52, 82
 Wexford, 13, 66, 198, 206, 209
 Whig origin of term, 216
 Whigs 226, 230, 240, 245, 261 270
 White Sea 40
 Wigan, battle of 194 206
 Wight, Isle of, 11, 19, 20, 26, 28, 194
 Wilberforce, Mr., 302.
 Wilhelm II, Emperor of Germany, 370
 Wilkes, John, 263, 266
 William king, I, Duke of Normandy and Conqueror, 49-56, II Rufus, 56, 57, 61; III, of Orange, 225-36, IV, 316-23; son of Henry I, 59; of Wickham (Wyleham), 123
 Winchester, 39, 41, 42 57.
 Windsor Castle 100, 101.
 Witan-gemot, 43.
 Woden, god 27
 Wolfe, General, 259, 260
 Wolsey, Cardinal, 130, 136, 148
 Wool, trade in, 99
 Worcester, battle of, 193, 200, 202, 207
 Wordsworth, William, 285, 324
 Wren Sir Christopher, 204.
 Wyatt, Sir Thomas, 146
 Wychffe, John, 99, 100 132.

 Yandabo treaty of 313
 York, 21, 23, 53, 192;
 Richard, Duke of, 113, 114, 121, Edward of (IV), 115-18, 121, young Duke of 118.
 Yorkshire, 53 60 100, 120.
 Yorktown, 270 283.

 Zulu war, 355, 364.